

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

FEBRUARY, 1906

NO. 8

A Socialist Sociology.

IN NO field are the gains of socialism more striking than in that of technical sociology. In spite of antagonism toward the proletarian standpoint by those who write the books the fundamental doctrines of socialism are surely and with considerable rapidity permeating the whole of the new science of sociology. It is exceptionally gratifying that in just the degree that the basic principles of socialism are adopted, do modern sociological works gain in value, and this measured not by the judgments of socialists, but by even the bourgeois students of society. For these reasons we have no hesitation in saying that the recent work on "General Sociology" by Prof. Albion W. Small of the University of Chicago is by far the greatest contribution yet made to the science of sociology. He announces as his thesis that "The central line in the path of methodological progress is marked by gradual shifting of effort from analogical representation of social structures to real analysis of social processes." Stripped of its somewhat scholastic terms this is simply saying that the modern sociologist has stopped comparing society to an organism, human or otherwise and is studying the actual course of social events.

After a discussion of the subject matter, definitions, history, and problems of sociology he proceeds to set forth his own philosophy and this is the way he starts, "In the beginning were interests." The socialist may well start at this familiar phraseology, but there is more to follow. He tells us that "the social process is a continuous formation of groups around interests,"

*) General Socio'ogy by Albion W. Small. University of Chicago Press. Cloth, 729 pages, \$4.00 net.

and "The whole life-process, so far as we know it, whether viewed in its individual or its social phase, is at last the process of developing, adjusting, and satisfying interests." Once more, "Sociology might be said to be the science of human interests and their working under all conditions." This idea is italicized and repeated over and over again until there can be no doubt of the author's position.

He goes on to tell us that "the conspicuous element in the history of the race so far as it has been recorded is universal conflicts of interest." One naturally looks for a foot note at this point referring to the phrase in "The Communist Manifesto" stating that "The whole history of mankind has been a history of class struggles," but he does not find it, although we are told once more, that "The latest word of sociology is that human experience yields the most and deepest meaning when read from first to last in terms of the evolution, expression, and accommodation of interests," and that "each class wants either to retain or to increase its power to inforce its own estimate of its own economic rights."

After this, who shall say that the socialists have not conquered the sociologists. But this is but the beginning. When he comes to discuss the "Types of Antagonistic Interest in States" he follows the socialist doctrine still further. He points out that "There is a difference between danger to an interest or to the standard of life represented by a particular class, and danger which may threaten the individual existence of persons within the class," something which socialists have expended tons of paper and gallons of ink to try to explain to those who were unable to distinguish between individual and class interests.

When he comes to take up the struggle between the capitalists and the working class we find him stating plainly that:

"In the first place, capital itself produces nothing. It earns nothing. This is contrary to general economic presumptions, and all forms of orthodox economic doctrine covertly or expressly appropriate certain amounts of inference from the opposite assumptions to buttress their own positions. Capital puts in a claim to the spoils of struggle in the economic and political field, just as though it were an active factor in production. Capital claims for itself a portion of the product of industry. This is quite different from the valid claim of the capitalist as a laborer to his share of values produced. Incidental to its pushing of this claim, capital collects a share of industrial products in the form of interest, profits, dividends, etc. In other words, the capitalist collects, besides his personal dues as a laborer, another portion of products credited to the impersonal factor, capital."

Neither is he blind to the fact pointed out by Marx that the capitalist is always a capitalist for the sake of the working class or the state, as the following quotation will show:

"The capitalist is prone to deny the soft impeachment, whenever he is accused of legal or moral wrong in advancing capitalistic interests. He

is sustained by an unfaltering sense of support by the State, and he comes to feel that honor and emolument go, in the case of his class at least, where honor and emolument are due. Because the capitalist wants the continued favor of the State, it is for his interest that public measures should always maintain programs to which the capitalist will be indispensable. It is for his interest that the State shall always be in need of money. He is interested in promoting vast undertakings far ahead of effective demand, except that stimulated by capitalistic instincts. Capital is tempted to promote excessive and artificial commerce, overproduction at certain points, overpopulation at others. In these artificial conditions, capital is sure to find employment. It can exert monopolies, collect its interest, control its incidental losses, and make them fall most heavily on the class of small capital or the various labor interests."

The impossibility of the middle class acting effectively is seen and we are told that "The middle rank has no firm bond of coherence because its members seize every opportunity to become or seem to become members of the upper rank." Here he is approaching closer and closer to the inevitable conclusion. One step further is taken along the track when he tells us that the "social problem is to give freest scope to those interests which actually require for their realization the largest sum of other interests." Only one more step would have been necessary and that would have been to have carried this chapter to its logical conclusion by pointing out that in our present society it is the proletariat which does require the largest sum of interests for the realization of its aims. Had he done this the chapter might easily have served as a socialist propaganda leaflet.

Not only is the doctrine of the class struggle accepted,—its foundation, the materialistic interpretation of history is also recognized. Indeed it would seem in the beginning as if he intended to out-Marx Marx when he states that "Every social question, from electing a Pope down to laying out a country road, is in the last analysis a question of what to do in the face of grudging soil, and the cruel climate, and the narrow space, of the region from which we get our food," and "If we should pass in review all the social theorizings of the last century no more frequent vice would be in evidence than some form of virtual denial that social conduct must square with the requirements of physical surroundings." He even instances specifically the one great historical event which has been most frequently alleged as offering an exception to the materialistic interpretation of history and declares that, "We might find also that the crusades were less inspired by piety than by poverty, and that this poverty was primarily the correlate of outraged physical law."

He also quotes with approval the following from Prof. John Dewey:

"His thesis is that occupations determine the fundamental modes of human activity; and that the occupation presupposing different immediate and remote objects of desire, and requiring variations in fundamental modes of activity, produces variations of mental type, including variations

of desires. For instance, the hunting life differs in turn from the agricultural, the pastoral, the military, the trading, the manually productive, the intellectual, etc. Each of these different kinds of life presents distinct classes of problems. Each stimulates its peculiar classes of desire. Each promotes the formation of peculiar habits, in adapting effort to satisfaction of the desires. Each of these types of habit, formed by an earlier and necessary stage in conquering the conditions of life, tends to persist; it reappears as a modifier of the impulses and habits that survive, because more appropriate, in a later stage."

Certainly no socialist ever claimed more than this for the materialistic interpretation of history. Indeed his later statement of Prof. Dewey is practically an adaptation of the introduction to "The Communist Manifesto" and Marx's preface to his "Critique of Political Economy," yet no reference is given to either of these. As is the usual case with sociological writers credit is given to Loria, whose notorious plagiarism in this direction should be familiar to every scholar, so frequently has it been exposed. Indeed he goes even further than this and in a foot note implies that "Marx and his followers" have somehow evolved something else as a materialistic interpretation of history and gives as a reference on this point Masaryk's *Die Grundlagen des Marxismus*! The Marxian who knows anything about Masaryk's work realizes that this is about the limit of unfairness.

He recognizes the fact which the socialists have long been pointing out that a sociology which does not concern itself with social betterment is a fruitless and useless study and speaks as strongly on this as any one could ask.

It will be manifestly unfair, however, to Dr. Small to treat him simply as a copyist of the socialists; indeed there is every reason to believe that he has reached his conclusions independent of and ignorant of the socialist writings. He has done very much more than this, he has developed and synthesized lines of thought as no socialist writer has done. He has given a much more satisfactory survey of sociological thought in his historical portion than anything hitherto published. He actually passes from a static to the dynamic stage in sociology, and he has succeeded in this direction far better than even Ward. We do not believe that it is too much to say that methodologically he has laid down the lines along which the sociologists of the future must work and this is all that he has claimed to do. But he really has done more. In the part dealing with the "Social Process Considered as a System of Ethical Problems" he has written what, in our opinion, is by far the strongest and best statement of social ethics (and there can be no other kind of ethics) that has ever appeared. His beginning is especially suggestive:

"Modern men are puzzled and perplexed and baffled by the incidents of their own activities. Political and industrial facts are the best illustrations, but in using them we must insist that they are illustrative

merely. They are not the whole or the most of life. The production of wealth in prodigious quantities, the machine-like integration of the industries, the syndicated control of capital and the syndicated organization of labor, the conjunction of interests in production and the collision of interests in distribution, the widening chasm between luxury and poverty, the security of the economically strong and the insecurity of the economically weak, the domination of politics by pecuniary interests, the growth of capitalistic world-politics, the absence of commanding moral authority, the well-nigh universal instinct that there is something wrong in our social machinery and that society is gravitating toward a crisis, the thousand and one demands for reform, the futility or fractionality of most ameliorative programs—all these are making men wonder how long we can go on in a fashion that no one quite understands and that everyone feels at liberty to condemn."

In short, Prof. Small recognizes that "Society is ethically bankrupt. We have some ethical assets but they are a small percentage of our abilities. Speaking generally, your ethical capital consists of a heterogeneous collection of provincial moralities.".....

Sociology alone can furnish this "ethical capital." Once more he admits that the socialists were right when they ridiculed and condemned those sociologists who dwelt in the realm of "pure science" and refused to consider the practical application of their principle. "Sociology," he tell us "would have no sufficient reason for existence if it did not contribute at least to a knowledge of what is worth doing." When he comes to determine his standard of ethics he once more finds himself in accord with the socialists. To show just how true this is we present the two following quotations:

"All the systems of ethics, and all the codes of morals, have been men's gropings toward ability to express this basic judgment: That is good, for me or for the world around me, which promotes the on-going of the social process. That is bad, for me or for the world around me, which retards the on-going of the social process."

Again:

"This social process is continuous advance in the development, adjustment, and satisfaction of the health, wealth, sociability, knowledge, beauty, and rightness desires."—Small, "General Sociology," pp. 676 and 707.

"In each and every stage of society the test of the fitness of any system of ethics lies in the proof that it does or does not conform to those conditions which make for the progress of the race. By progress is here meant an increasing control by man over the forces of nature; a greater ability to make them serve his comfort and perform his tasks; in short, a growing mastery of his environment. This greater control is equivalent to a higher development of the human race."—May Wood Simons in "International Socialist Review," Dec. 1900.

We hope no one will misunderstand the placing of these quotations in parallel columns as in the least an insinuation of plagiarism on the part of Prof. Small. Such a suggestion is the furthestest from our minds. We do this simply to show how as fast as the new science of sociology really attains anything

worth while it does so by approaching closer and closer to the position which socialists have held for half a century. That he, himself really realizes that fact is seen by the following quotation taking from almost the last chapter of his book:

"The type of life that civilization has developed calls for a type of persons capable of the most intensely refined and many-sided co-operation. Ability to fit into an infinitely refined and complex system of co-operation is the mark of fitness for the present social environment. At the same time democracy has given to the individual both demand and capacity for a share in consumption of all the achievements of civilization. Unless this demand is measurably satisfied, the fitness of the individual for his part in co-operation is reduced toward the point of obstruction. That is: On the most cynical basis of calculation which could be adopted, the program of civilization is a system of inevitable co-operation. If control of the co-operation were in the hands of one despot, he would be obliged, in order to keep the system from breaking down, to run it in the interest of all the persons necessary for the co-operation. To do this, he would be obliged to run it on a plan which would admit all the persons necessary to the co-operation to progressive participation in all the advantages of the co-operation."

Here he has practically summed up for a co-operative commonwealth as the logical conclusion of his work.

On the whole this book must be considered a part of socialist literature and a contribution to the socialist analysis of society. To be sure he is not always consistent. There are points where he modifies his materialism and attempts to explain away his acceptance of the class struggle. Yet taking the book as a whole we believe that the future historian of the socialist movement will classify it as a part of the literature of the International Socialist movement.

A. M. SIMONS.

Revolutionary Anthem.

by U. O. Hison.

Arise, ye wage cursed sons of toil,
Ye fatherlandless sons who moil
Your lives in poverty;
Arise to manhood's glorious
height,
Assert it an eternal right,
And win it by your Titan might—
A comrade liberty.

CHORUS:

Arise a conquering band!
No more shall masters base infest
A world of comrade brothers
blest;
From every land, extend the hand
Of comradeship unto the rest
At Liberty's behest.

Arise, ye tillers of the soil,
Ye too are comrade sons of toil;
List to the ages call
Aye shed the horny callous hand
Base brutal masters praise as
grand,
And drive these vampires from
the land,
The land God gave to all.

Arise, ye toilers with the mind
In comrade fellow workers find
Blest solidarity;
Contemtuons tyrannies that gall,
Fight till the last of you shall fall
Or till ye win the world for all—
For all humanity.

Arise! Arise! Time's spirit calls
On you to batter down the walls
Of base oppression's day;
In this the ages' striking hour,
A mighty giant host ye tower;
Did ye but know your latent
power
Your will none could gainsay.

Aye, angry Demos now hurl down
The savage terror of your frown
On who your rights disown;
Your tendons firm as damask
steel

In mighty arms, let tyrant feel
The conquering power they wield
The future is your own.

Strike off the master's galling
chain,
Demand as your rightful domain
Fair foster mother earth;
Her all abundant fruitfulness
Shall satisfy your dire distress,
With plenty shall your children
bless—

The world shall have rebirth.

Press on! Press on! Unto the
goal
Where from the enthralled human
soul

Constricting fetters fall;
Press on! Ye have a world to
gain

And nought to lose but galling
chain
Your ignorance binds with fret-
ting pain

Till freedom's won for all.

Stretch forth your powerful cun-
ning hands
And cull from all the outstretched
lands

Beneath God's generous sun
All art the ages hitherto
Have wrought ideally for you;
A purer art shall rise for you
When ye the world have won.

O'erthrow contemptuous mastery,
Destroy the curse of wavery;
The great are only great
Because unto their pride you
kneel;

Arise! Contempt for you they feel,
Humility invites the heel
To worse your abject state.

The master's hand is at your
throats,
In haughty pride he o'er you
gloats,

Your sweated blood's his toll;
 In luxury and elegance
 He teaches you your fate is
 chance,
 He cures you with ignorance.
 His hauteur covers your soul.

Arise and damn the master's
 power
 In the righteous avenging hour
 Of the triumphant cause;
 Your soul, oh Demos, he would
 slay,
 Your daughters fair have been his
 prey,
 Your sons, his slaves for paltry
 pay—
 Annul his cursed laws.

Rejoice! our masters built on sand
 A tottering realm that cannot
 stand

Its fall e'en now they wail;
 They built on privilege and class,
 Corroding elements that pass;
 Ye build on unity and mass.
 Your cause can never fail.

Ye are the basic social rock
 The clashing class strife ne'er
 shall shock,

Whereon shall stately rise
 Built in all, on all, for all—
 The commonwealth that cannot
 fall,

A refuge from the tyrant thrall
 Of blood-stained centuries.

Arise, ye sons of destiny,
 Ye patrons of equality,
 A compact sturdy band!
 With gleaming light from Orient
 skies
 Streaming into your waking eyes

Move forward to the fight!
 Arise!
 Go forth possess the land!

Arise! Arise! Ye cannot fail!
 Shall aught that's base with you
 avail

To crucify your cause?
 Shall generations still unborn
 The craven soul in their sires
 scorn?

Ye shall your lives and theirs
 adorn
 If ye fulfil Time's laws.

Exult in your exuberant youth,
 Boldly in Time's evolving truth,
 Save the expanding soul;
 Arise, your youthful form unbend
 In God-like stature stand as men,
 Regain ye savage rights as when
 No master smote the soul.

Grasp in your mind the latent
 power,
 Revealed in this, Time's dawning
 hour,

Of science, music, art
 Forge from them weapons for
 your fight
 And battle on for Time and Right
 Against the forces of the night
 That blight the human heart.

In North, in South, in East, in
 West
 From age long strife in joy be
 blest

Nor slave nor master be
 In comrade love ye all shall reign
 When strength of arm and power
 of brain
 The heritage of mankind gain
 A comrade liberty.

Materialism and Socialism.

II.

BEFORE leaving fundamentals and the consideration of inorganic nature, in our discussion, I wish to call attention to some other difficulties in the way of a rational mechanical explanation of the universe.

CONSERVATION OF ENERGY AND INDESTRUCTIBILITY OF MATTER IN DOUBT.

The phenomena of the X-rays and of radium have left the questions of conservation of energy and the indestructibility of matter in doubt. Indeed, many physicists admit that these, supposed fully demonstrated principles may be but approximations to the truth, as Boyle's law has been shown to be though it was long thought to be rigidly true. There are no *a priori* reasons for supposing them true. But assuming that they are true, as seems probable as far as our inductions have gone,

THE PRINCIPLE OF DISSIPATION OF ENERGY

is as well established as that of conservation. The sun is continually pouring out its flood of radiant energy, of which but an infinitesimal portion is intercepted and held by the planets. And the planets themselves are radiating far more energy into space than they receive. Likewise every star is dissipating energy; though an occasional collision in space transforms the molar motion of the colliding bodies into heat and light, which, again, is radiated into space. The ultimate result of this process must be, in finite time, the transformation of all energy into some one or more of the radiant forms, viz., light, heat, electricity, and the establishing of an equilibrium of motion throughout the interstellar ether. This must be the end of all life—all change in matter; since heterogeneity shall have been destroyed, and in its place, an infinite homogeneity; all matter shall have given up its motion to the all-pervading ether. There can be no mechanical process conceived, undirected by intelligence, by which the molar motion and the unequal diffusion of energy and matter can be restored. Thus do our rational processes take us inevitably to the time when the machinery of the universe has run down, its motive power existing only in the form of an infinitely diffused vibration.

The corollary of this proposition is that the present condition of non-equilibrated forces (or energy) has been in prog-

ress in finite time only—had its beginning at some time in the finite past; for in less than infinite time all of the energies of the universe would have been dissipated, and the universe would now be dead.

CURVED SPACE, LIMITED SPACE, ETC.

The ideas of "limited space," "curved space," space of "fourth, fifth, and higher dimensions," which might have some bearing on the questions at issue, must be passed by as ideas of an illegitimate order. If, they exist in fact, as some high mathematical authorities have contended to be possible and probable, they transcend all our powers of cognition, and must be placed in the category of those mysterious and inconceivable things, ideas, and states often assumed to explain other mysteries; they give us no rational explanation.

It will not be necessary to consider further the difficulties to be met by the materialist in attempting to give a rational explanation of the phenomena of inorganic nature; suffice it to say that difficulties and insurmountable barriers are to be met at every step of his progress from matter to life, the subject which I shall next briefly discuss.

THE FORMULA OF EVOLUTION.

Herbert Spencer has attempted to sum up all the processes of nature and express them in a single formula, as follows:

"Evolution is the integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation."

This formula has been quite generally accepted by materialists, and many others, indeed, as stating a general law of the universe, established by the widest induction. But the present writer, in a pamphlet published in 1892, demonstrated mathematically, from data supplied by the great physicists, that this formula does not apply to organic nature; that instead of the integration being accompanied by a dissipation of motion (energy), it is accompanied by an absorption and inclusion of motion. (A Critical Essay on the "Law" of the "Integration of Matter and Concomitant Dissipation of Motion.") If this be true (and the proof has never yet been successfully controverted) we have in life a process, or factor, we might say, restoring the non-equilibrium of forces—catching the radiant energy in its flight from the sun and storing it up in aggregates of high potentiality, a reversal of the supposed "universal law of dissipation." The mechanical theory here fails again; it cannot give us the *modus operandi* of

the change from energy of low potentiality to that of a higher, from a vibratory energy to that which appears to be devoid of all motion, but which at the same time is capable of being transformed into energy of molecular or molar motion. It is as though in a steam boiler aggregates of molecules were to form having a higher pressure (a greater amount of internal motion) than that of the surrounding atmosphere of steam. Only by some such hypothesis as the goblins proposed by J. Clerk Maxwell to show how intelligence may catch energy of a high-speed and release only that of the lower-speed particle, can the non-equilibrium be restored. We are wont to explain these phenomena by attributing them to the selective power of life; but this explanation implies intelligence.

THE MYSTERY OF LIFE

We are met at the threshold of this discussion with the question, "What is life, and how does live matter differ from dead matter?" Many philosophers have attempted to answer this question, and, from a materialistic standpoint, Spencer's definition is probably as good as any which has been made. He says, "Life in all of its manifestations, inclusive of intelligence in its highest forms, consists in the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations."

Grant this to be true, how can the blind, clashing atoms or molecules effect this adjustment? In what consists the difference that live matter adjusts and dead matter does not? How does the vegetable organism wrench the atom of carbon from its combined oxygen, appropriating the one and discarding the other? If the living organism be but a perfected machine, it should always act in accordance with the fixed and undeviating laws of mechanics. A steam shovel or dredge scoops up mud, stones, and other matter indiscriminately, with a uniform absence of utility and design. The vegetable organism selects what is useful and necessary to its growth in a manner indicative of selective intelligence. A bubble of marsh gas in passing through the superincumbent stratum of water takes a vertically upward course as the line of least resistance. If an inverted jar of water be immediately above, the bubble is caught in the jar and can never descend through the water to escape under the edge of the jar. It is not so with the frog; if he finds himself caught, after surveying his prison and finding no other avenue of escape, he descends to escape by the only avenue open to him. It will be urged that the vibratory energy of heat and light dissociates the carbonic dioxide in the leaf of the vegetable organism, setting free the oxygen and leaving the carbon behind. Very good; but how does it happen that this same vibratory energy comes

in contact with an infinite number of molecules of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere and none are dissociated except those brought in contact with the living vegetable cell? And further, when dissociation has been effected how does the atom of carbon enter and become a constituent part of the cell? To this last question it will doubtless be urged that the cell is formed by chemical affinity. Many interrogations might be made as to this chemical affinity of which so much is required, but space forbids. I will, however, call attention to the fact that all of our organic chemistry in the laboratory is confined to tearing down organic cells; and the building up of a single cell has never been effected except through the agency of life.

When an organism dies the chemical forces as we know them in the laboratory assert themselves and the organic cell breaks down, the constituent elements going into new and more stable compounds. From these phenomena it would appear that life so overrules and directs the chemical forces that they form compounds such as are never formed in the absence of life, and which cannot be maintained intact except in the presence of the life which formed them.

FROM MATTER TO MIND AN IMPASSABLE GULF.

When we come to consider the phenomena of mind we can conceive of no possible way by which mind can be expressed in terms of matter. How can we identify the objective vibration of air with the subjective sensation of sound; light vibration with light; or any object with the sensation or idea of it? We may trace a parallelism between sensation and ideas and their corresponding brain events, but that one can become the other we cannot conceive. Spencer, Huxley, and Tyndall recognized the gulf between mind and matter as impassable, yet each with characteristic looseness of logic ignored the gulf and actually treated it as passed by a continuous series of steps from the original nebula to the highest forms of thought. This uncritical attitude of mind is assumed by all materialistic philosophers, with lofty expressions of contempt for what they term metaphysics, whenever one adverts to their irrationality. The automatists of the school represented by Spencer and Huxley regard consciousness as a sort of "epiphenomenon" accompanying the physical events of the brain, but having nothing to do with these phenomena—having no causal relation to any physical event. Mind appears at a certain stage in development as an

* The best explanation Haeckel can give us of the operations of mind in consciousness is to call it a reflection, or image, of the external fact; the brain being the mirror which images the external world. But how the consciousness, the awareness, comes into being, he fails to explain. To tell us that it is an image, or picture, tells us nothing of the fact.

"illegitimate birth" of so small a magnitude that it fails to attract attention; and when it grows into a large-sized fact, it is only necessary to trace it to its small beginning to satisfactorily account for it. Such in substance is the characterization given by Prof. William James to the automatist's "Development of Mind." But it would appear that the automatist's process is not worthy to be called a birth at all; it is without father or mother—a pure assumption, a scientific(?) "hand-me-down," the maker of which is not even suspected of an existence outside the brain of the philosopher who assumes it.

UNCRITICAL REASONING OF MATERIALISTIC MONISTS.

Of all the exponents of materialistic monism (or automatism) none are bolder in assumption or more rash in ignoring reason, causation, design, than Prof. Ernest H. Haeckel of the University of Jena. He places the terms into a series in accordance with his view of evolution, and behold! the "Riddle of the Universe" is resolved.* He quotes with approval J. C. Vogt's theory of substance (styled the Pyknotic Theory: Pyknatoms with Souls), which is nearly as rational and intelligible (though not quite) as Madam Blavatsky's theosophical explanation of mind, matter, souls, and the several different bodies belonging thereto.

* Professor Haeckel quotes from Emil du Bois-Reymond, from a lecture delivered in 1880 in the Leibnitz session of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, and disposes of the difficulties enumerated by the lecturer in a very brief and summary manner. The ease with which Professor Haeckel disposes of difficulties is seen from the enumeration and comment made by the professor given herewith. By du Bois-Reymond: (1) "The nature of matter. (2) The origin of motion. (3) The origin of life. (4) The (apparently pre-ordained) orderly arrangement of nature. (5) The origin of simple sensation and consciousness. (6) Rational thought, the origin of the cognate faculty, speech. (7) The question of the freedom of the will." Comment by Professor Haeckel: "Three of these seven enigmas are considered by the orator of the Berlin Academy to be entirely transcendent and insoluble—they are the first, second, and fifth; three others (3d, 4th, and 6th) he considers capable of solution, though extremely difficult; as to the seventh, the last world enigma, the freedom of the will, which is of the greatest practical importance, he remains undecided. As my monism differs materially from that of the Berlin orator, and as his idea of the 'seven great enigmas' has been very widely accepted, it may be useful to indicate their true position at once. In my opinion the three transcendental problems (1, 2, and 3) are settled by our conception of substance (vide chap. xii); the three which he considers difficult, though soluble (3, 4, and 6) are decisively answered by our modern theory of evolution; the seventh and last, the freedom of the will, is not an object for critical study, scientific inquiry, at all, for it is a pure dogma, based on an illusion, and has no real existence."

The conception of substance which Professor Haeckel refers to is that above mentioned from J. C. Vogt, which has nothing to recommend it. It is mathematically impossible, and in no way can explain mass, gravitation, chemism, or any of the properties of matter. Dalton's atomic theory, now known to be impossible, goes much farther to explain observed phenomena. Haeckel's reference to the "modern theory of evolution" to explain the 3d, 4th, and 6th enigmas is to take a little life and allow it to grow; to take a little mind, primordial sensation, for example, and allow it to develop according to the law of attraction of likes, etc.; to take the original chaos, allow the fortuitous clashes to transform themselves into eddies, rhythms, etc., and, presto, all is explained. And as to free will, the universe is a machine, man is a machine, an automaton, and no machine can have any will, since it is governed by immutable law; therefore, free will in man is a dogma and not an object for critical study, etc. Such is the force of Haeckel's argumentation, in logical consistency and acumen unworthy of a child who has reached the age of twelve years. Yet, he is looked up to as one of the great lights of materialistic monism.

THE PSYCHOLOGIST'S FALLACY.

Objectively, and scientifically we know sound as air or some other medium vibrating longitudinally. These vibrations impinge on the tympanum of the ear and are conveyed by nerve fibers to the brain. We have reason to believe, also, that there is a brain event corresponding to these vibrations. But the subjective sensation of sound is a phenomenon of a different order which no one would think of identifying with the vibration. The sensation, the feeling, the consciousness,—what is it, and how does it arise? To say that the mind mirrors the objective world helps us not at all. Can we imagine the mirror conscious of what it reflects; the telescope objective, of the image it builds in the focus of the eye-piece or the eye? We may doubtless imagine it as analogous to the formation of an image in the eye, of which consciousness takes cognizance; but we cannot believe in the consciousness of a mere mechanism, however perfect. The materialistic monist has no use for consciousness; and as it has no place in his mechanical scheme, he calls it an "epiphenomenon," a sort of "by-product of the brain," a "spectator of operations, but one which has nothing whatever to do with them."

The universal practice of associationalists, and some others perhaps, of attributing the thinker's knowledge and experience to the thing thought of and experienced, has been very appropriately designated the psychologist's fallacy.

THE GULF BETWEEN MIND AND MATTER IGNORED.

The impossibility of passing from matter to mind by any series of continuous transition steps or gradations is recognized by nearly all philosophers. Spencer, Huxley, and Tyndall never attempted, as far as the present writer is aware, to bridge the chasm between material and psychic phenomena. They were content to assume life and mind at successive stages of evolution, as they assume matter at the beginning of the process. Others, like Professor Bain, assumed the double aspect theory of matter,—that mind and material properties are merely two aspects of one and the same underlying substance, the two sides of the same shield. This connecting of the two classes of phenomena, however, is a mere verbal subterfuge which does not explain. It is a dualism in which two entirely different orders of phenomena are tied together by some unknown and mysterious nexus. In the objective world we know mind as connected with matter only under certain peculiar conditions and circumstances. The double aspect view leads to parallelism in philosophy with no causal relation between the two classes of phenomena. Boscovich's atomic theory of points of force has been modified by making the points of force mental; and this theory has much in common with idealism, or perhaps with

the mental monadism of Leibnitz, Herbart, and Lotze, differing principally from idealism in its multiplicity of mental units in the place of one, and in regarding space and time as having an actual objective existence, absolute, or independent of all subjective relations. Again, Clifford put forward his mind stuff theory postulating an original material of mind as well as of matter, both eternal in existence, or indestructible. This likewise leads to parallelism in philosophy, with no causal nexus between mind and matter.

PLURALISM CANNOT BE FUSED INTO UNITY.

The great objection to all these theories here but briefly alluded to, is in their pluralism. We cannot conceive of the union of a number of mental units to form another mental unit. The same difficulty arises in conceiving the human mind and consciousness as made up of lesser mental units and consciousnesses, as we find in conceiving a separate and higher consciousness of a body of individuals. We may speak figuratively of a class conscious; but we cannot believe that there is a mind and consciousness of the body of individuals in any sense above or distinct from the several individual minds and consciousnesses. To make the mind a colony of lesser minds is in every sense repugnant to our rationality.

AN ANIMATED, CONSCIOUS UNIVERSE.

Still another theory is that the whole universe of matter is animated and conscious, every particle having all the attributes of matter and mind. This differs slightly, if at all, from Bain's double aspect theory, though it would seem to give room for freedom of will, will being one of the attributes of each particle of matter. This assumption, however, leads us into another difficulty in accounting for the uniform behavior of matter, chemically and physically, when placed under like conditions. If atoms have free will, then we should expect variety in behavior of like atoms placed under like conditions. Experience seems to negative this assumption.

HIGHER MENTAL PROCESSES.

All materialistic systems of psychology pursue analogous methods, in the treatment of mind, to those adopted in explanation of physical phenomena. Certain nervous discharges follow certain paths of least resistance in the brain and give rise to habit, reflexes, and all unconscious action. Repetition determines certain main paths of nervous discharge to the exclusion of other minor paths of smaller discharge; and thus skill arises through such repetition. An impression once made on the brain is retained; and ever after an impression made by a

similar force and in a similar manner goes in part, at least, by the old path and the old impression is wholly or in part repeated, this repetition being called memory. The new impression brings up the old by a process known as the "law of association." By like analogies this law is extended to the uniting of likes and the differentiation of unlikes; and new images are produced in imagination. The fitting together of likes and the non-fitting of unlikes gives us the rational process of comparison. The arrangement of events in time, as prior or subsequent, and the fixed recurrence of such order give rise to the idea of causation.

These explanations seem at first sight plausible, but when examined critically they are seen to be a mere rope of sand. The materialistic psychologist places these things and events in juxtaposition and rational order, and in thought transfers the doing to the things and processes themselves. He sees the rational order and reasons that the things and processes can see and be conscious of the same order. He sees the vibrations follow a certain law which he has discovered, and he transfers this seeing to the vibrations themselves. The coherence of these things and processes is no coherence at all. They only appear coherent by the web woven about them by the psychologist's own mind. He can imagine a rope of sand to be tensible and coherent; but in fact it does not cohere. And so the building up of mind by his so-called laws of association is only coherent in his imagination; the elements are disparate things which cannot be fused together.

The foregoing brief argument is sufficient to show the utter inadequacy of mechanism to explain mind; and for the present I shall leave this branch of the discussion, reserving the third article for a discussion of the necessary consequences of materialistic logic.

CHAS. H. CHASE.

(To be continued.)

The Great Contradiction in the Marxian Theory of Value.

WE have seen in the preceding articles that the facts relied on by Marx-critics to "refute" Marx fail them signally when put to the test. These facts rather tally with the Marxian theory. While, however, this may be sufficient to parry the attacks of these Marx-critics and work the discomfiture of all those who should attempt to attack Marx with the weapons of "logic" and "facts of experience," this does not furnish the highest kind of *positive* proof of the correctness of the Marxian theory demanded by Marx himself and his followers. Marx and the Marxists have often been reproached for being too strict and exacting. This they undoubtedly are. But first of all, with *themselves*, Marx has often been accused of being addicted to tedious repetitions in his writing, his critics being unable to see that Marx merely approached his subject from all justifiable points of view in order to make sure that his conclusions were correct. We have already stated before that he never rested his case on purely logical deductions. These only served him as a means of grasping and explaining the *facts* which must in each case supply the proof. But in looking to the *facts* for his proofs, he was not content merely with the ordinary facts of "experience" in the sense in which his critics understand the term. Of course, these had to tally with his conclusions before he adopted them, but they merely gave him the *prima facie* proof. True to his historical ideas, the real decisive proof he sought in the facts of history, or, rather, in the "facts of experience" considered in their historical setting and connection.

So it was with his theory of Value and Surplus Value. Considering that the question of value lies at the very foundation of the capitalistic mode of production and distribution, he insisted that a theory of value in order to be accepted as correct, must not only be in accordance with the facts as they are, but it must furnish a key to the understanding of capitalistic *development*, to the understanding of the *facts of capitalism in their movement*. It must explain not only the statics of capitalism, but its dynamics. A theory of surplus-value, in order to be accepted as correct must show the sources and volume of the profits of the capitalist class not only as they exist to-day, but throughout the

entire historical epoch dominated by the capitalistic mode of production and distribution. It must account for the different variations in these profits, if any be discovered. It *must explain the development of profits.*

And it is here that the Marxian theory has to record its greatest triumph. In philosophy as well as in economics, it is its historical character that gives the Marxian theory its peculiar import, that forms its essence. What does the history of capitalistic profits show? If there is anything that is well established in connection with capitalistic profits, it is the tendency of the *rate of profit on capital to diminish.* With the development of capitalism and the *growth of the mass of capital*, the return on capital in the shape of profits is constantly becoming smaller. While the gross amounts of profits obtained by the capitalist class is constantly increasing with the growth of the mass of capital, the amount of the profits in proportion to the whole capital employed, and therefore, the *rate of profit on a given amount of capital, tends to constantly diminish.* This is known in political economy as the "law of the falling rate of profit." Whence this law? How account for the falling rate of profit? No theory of value before or after Marx could give a satisfactory answer to these questions. As Marx said of the science of political economy as he found it:—

"She saw the phenomenon (of the falling rate of profit) and was agonized by attempts at conflicting explanations. Because, however, of the great importance of this law for capitalistic production, it may be said, that this law forms the great mystery about the solving of which the whole science of political economy revolves ever since the days of Adam Smith. And that the difference between the different schools of the science since Adam Smith consists in the different attempts to solve this problem."

There is no such mystery, however, when the Marxian theory of value sheds its light on the underlying basis of the capitalistic mode of production, and the laws of its development are exposed to the light of day. Not only does the Marxian theory offer a satisfactory explanation, but such explanation flows naturally and of necessity therefrom. And it is as simple and as clear as daylight.

The capital employed by a capitalist "producer" in his business is divided into two parts:—One which he spends for his place, fixtures, machinery, raw goods, etc.; and the other which he spends in paying wages to his men, in "employing labor" as it is euphoniously styled. Let us call the capital of the first category "constant" capital, and that of the second cate-

gory "variable" capital. The reason for these appellations is because according to the Marxian theory, the first kind of capital remains constant, unchanged by the process of production, whereas the second kind of capital varies, changes, to be more specific, *increases* in that process. As was already shown, only labor creates value, and that the capitalist's profits come from the "surplus" value. When a capitalist receives a profit out of the process of production,—his capital increases in the operation,—that variation is due to the capital invested in paying for labor, the other part of his capital, the raw materials and other things can not vary themselves, they are merely reproduced, they remain a constant quantity. Let us see how the development of capitalistic production affects the two parts of capital, and what bearing this has on the rate of profit.

John Brown, Sr., went into the business of manufacturing shoes in the year of Our Lord, 1850. He started out with a capital of, let us say, \$500.00, four hundred of which he spent in fixing up his plant and buying a stock of raw material necessary in the business, and the remaining one hundred he used in paying his labor. We will assume, for the sake of simplicity, that he employed ten men, paying each ten dollars per week, and that the "turn-over" in his business was such that he cashed in every week the proceeds of his manufactured product, so that he did not need to invest for labor any more than one week's wages. Let us further assume that the state of the productivity of labor was such that the labor of one of our manufacturer's men during one week, created a product of the value of twenty dollars. (In addition, of course, to the value of the raw materials, etc. consumed in its production). Under these conditions the value of the product manufactured by John Brown, weekly, will be two hundred dollars, one hundred of which will be "necessary" value (the amount paid in wages), and one hundred, "surplus" value. This will be his profit. (In order to simplify matters, we assume that he deals with his consumers direct, thus cutting out the middlemen's share of the profit.) The ratio of the "necessary" to the "surplus" value, which we will call the rate of surplus value or the rate of the exploitation of labor, is that of 1 to 1 or 100 per cent. John Brown does not figure that way, however. While he is interested in paying his men as little as possible and make them produce as much as possible, whether by foul means or fair, he is not at all interested to know what proportion the surplus-value they create bears to their wages. Good business man that he is, he wants to know what return the capital invested by him in the enterprise has brought him. He finds that his investment of five hundred dollars has brought

him a profit (consisting of the surplus-value), of one hundred dollars, or 20 per cent. per week.

On such profits John Brown's business thrived, and he accumulated a fortune. He is now resting in peace with his forefathers, and his son and heir, John Brown, Jr., now conducts the business. John Brown, Jr., upholds the traditions of the old house for making profits. But entirely new methods and processes of manufacturing shoes are now being used by him, as well as by everybody else who is in the market to compete with him. New machinery has been invented since the days when his father started the business. This machinery is "labor-saving" to a high degree. That is to say, it increases the productivity of labor, so that one man can do by its aid the work of several working without its aid. This machinery, however, is very costly; and its employment requires a large outlay for raw materials, since a man employs more raw materials in the same proportion as the productivity of labor increases. The "composition" of his capital,—that is to say, the proportionate shares thereof used as "constant" and "variable" capitals, respectively,—is, therefore, different from the composition of his father's capital, when the old man started in business. John Brown, Jr., employs a capital of twenty thousand dollars. Of this fully nineteen thousand are used as constant capital, and only one thousand to pay for the labor employed by him. This composition of capital, because it signifies a higher stage of the development of capitalism, we will call the higher composition, and the composition of the capital at the time the business was started we will call the lower composition. Now let us see what effect did the change in the composition of the capital have on the profits of the business.

Let us assume that the firm still retains the old scale of wages. Let us also assume that owing to the introduction of the improved machinery, (and allowing for the cheapening of the product in consequence) the value of the product of a man's labor has increased two-fold. What will be the result? His variable capital amounting to one thousand dollars, John Brown now employs one hundred men. The value of the weekly product of each man is forty dollars, and the value of the aggregate weekly product, four thousand dollars. Out of this, one thousand dollars represents the necessary value and three thousand is surplus value. His profits have increased enormously, but yet not in proportion to his capital. That is to say, while the gross amount of his profits is enormous, the *rate* of his profits, the percentage return of each dollar of capital, is considerably smaller. A profit of three thousand dollars on a capital of twenty

thousand makes only fifteen per cent., a decrease of five per cent. as compared with the older days.

The different ways in which the business of the older and the younger John Brown was organized, and the results flowing from the different organizations of their business, is typical of the development of capitalistic production in general, and correctly exemplifies it. It shows the *fact* of the falling rate of profit, and also gives the explanation therefor. The development of capitalist production consisting in the increased productivity of labor by reason of which the composition of capital becomes higher, this development *must* necessarily tend to lower the *rate* of interest or profit, for the profit is *obtained* only from the variable part of capital, which is constantly being diminished as compared with the constant part, whereas it is figured on the whole capital.

Our example does not, however, show the full effect of the change of the composition of capital on the profit rate. When left to itself, the change in the composition of capital has a tendency to lower the rate of profit much more than appears from our example. The reason for it is, that in our example we did not present the workings of this law in its purity, by changing the conditions of the problem. In the first instance we represented the workingmen as receiving one-half of the value they produced, whereas in the second we assumed that they received only one-quarter. Had we left the conditions of the problem the same in the second instance as in the first, that is, one-half the labor was necessary and one-half surplus, we would have had in the second instance with even a somewhat lower composition of capital than that assumed by us, say of eighteen thousand constant and two thousand variable,—a rate of interest of only ten per cent. instead of fifteen per cent. This would show the tendency in its purity. But it would not show the actual facts of the capitalistic development. Our example does so. In outline, of course. For, with the higher composition of capital, and the greater productivity of labor which it represents, grows the surplus part of the value produced, grows the rate of exploitation of labor. And this quite irrespective of the fact whether the workingmen are getting poorer pay or not, or whether their standard of living is becoming lower or not. They may even get in *real* wages, that is, in products, more than they got before, and still the rate of exploitation will grow, for with the productivity of labor products become cheaper, so that for the same amount of money received by them as wages the workingmen may buy a larger amount of products, and yet this amount will necessarily become constantly smaller in proportion to the

amount retained by the capitalist as surplus-product. In our example we have allowed for the cheapening on products of the productivity of labor, otherwise the increase in the value of the product would have to be more than twice with such a high composition of capital. The products consumed by them being cheaper, the workmen of John Brown, Jr., will get more products for their ten dollars per week than did their forefathers who worked for John Brown, Sr., and yet their share of the product produced will be one-half of that of their forefathers, and the rate of exploitation of labor will have increased three-fold since the times of John Brown, Sr. This is what actually happens in the course of the development of capitalistic production.

The greater productivity of labor resulting from the introduction of improved machinery gives the capitalists the possibility of increasing the rate of exploitation of labor, and they are never too slow to grasp the opportunity. This increases the *mass* of surplus-value, and consequently also the rate of profit. We, therefore, have two cross tendencies:—first, the tendency to lower the rate of profit by raising the composition of capital, thus diminishing, proportionately, the amount of variable capital which alone produces surplus-value; and second, to increase the rate of profit by increasing the rate of exploitation and thereby increasing that part of the product produced by the variable capital employed which goes to the capitalist as his surplus or profit. As the variable part of capital diminishes in proportion, the rate of exploitation grows. Of these two tendencies, however, the first is necessarily stronger, and the second can not overcome it for the simple reason that a part can not be greater, nor even as great as the whole. No matter to what proportions the rate of exploitation should grow, it can never absorb the whole product. In order that there should be a surplus product or value, there must necessarily be a necessary product or value. Any diminution, therefore, of the proportionate part of the capital employed by the capitalists as variable, must necessarily lead to some diminution of the rate profit, be it ever so small. Hence, the resultant tendency of a falling rate of profit. The actual extent of the fall will depend on the co-operation of a number of factors, no mean part being played by the success with which the capitalists will meet in their efforts to raise the rate of exploitation of labor in order to counterbalance the effects of the change in the composition of their capital.

This question of the rate of profits brings us to the so-called Great Contradiction in the Marxian theory, and to the question of the relation between the first and the third volumes of Capital. Before, however, entering upon its discussion, the present writer

wishes to say that he intends in a later work to put before the public some matters which will, in his opinion, put the whole subject in a new light. Those matters are, however, not specifically treated by Marx, and as these articles are merely intended to present the Marxian theory as *stated* by Marx, and the criticism of the theory as so stated, no reference will be made to them here, except to say that their net result does not in any way change the Marxian theory as here outlined, but amplifies it.

The Contradiction was first formulated and placed before the public in a somewhat sensational manner by Frederick Engels himself. In his preface to the second volume of *Capital*, published in 1884, after the death of Karl Marx, Engels challenged those Marxian critics of that day who had declared that Marx said nothing that was new, and that all the wisdom contained in *Capital* had already been promulgated before by Rodbertus, from whom Marx was supposed by them to have borrowed his theory of value, to explain "how an equal average rate of profit can and must be formed, not only without injury to the law of value, but really by reason thereof." He argued that if Marx said nothing new and his theory of value is no different than that of Rodbertus, these critics ought to be able to do that by the aid of Rodbertus' writings as supplemented by Marx's. This had the effect of setting a host of men to solving the problem. Most of those who attempted to accomplish the task were, however, not the Marx-critics to whom the challenge was directed, but disciples of Marx who went about the business not on the basis of Rodbertus' writings, which had very little to offer towards the solution of the problem, but on the basis of the laws of value as laid down by Marx in the first volume of *Capital*. It was the ambition of these writers to forestall the solution which Engels promised would be given by Marx himself in the third volume. In his preface to the third volume, published by him in 1894, Engels reviews the various efforts at solving this problem, and comes to the conclusion that none of them gave the correct solution, although some of them came pretty near it, notably Dr. Conrad Schmidt in his work on the subject which appeared in 1889. The correct solution, Engels says, is contained only in the third volume of *Capital* itself.

The solution of this problem, as given by Marx himself, in the third volume of *Capital*, and which is supposed to explain the great contradiction, is as follows:—

Assuming that the rate of exploitation of labor is the same in all the spheres of production in society, producing an equal rate of surplus value in all these spheres; that the capitals em-

ployed in the different spheres of production are of different degrees of composition, that is, of different character as to their division into constant and variable capital; and that nevertheless the rate of profit is equal in all the spheres of production, the problem is:—how does this come about, if the laws of value are as laid down by Marx. If two capitals, one whose composition is 90 C. plus 10 v. (90 per cent. constant and 10 per cent. variable), and one whose composition is 10 c. and 90 v., (10 per cent. constant and 90 per cent. variable) the rate of exploitation being the same, produce the same rate of surplus-value or profit, it is quite evident that the surplus-value, and therefore, all value, must have some entirely different source than labor. But that is just what is claimed by all political economists. It is assumed to be an established fact that the rate of profits is equal at any given time in all spheres of production or circulation of commodities, no matter what the degree of the composition of the capital employed in their production. In other words, that at any given time equal capitals will give equal returns, irrespective of the particular branch of industry in which they are employed and of the composition of the capital employed in that branch. But, says Marx, the supposed fact that equal amounts of capital 'bring' equal returns, no matter how employed, gives no indication whatever of the source of this profit. This, however, is really where the contradiction is supposed to lie. It is a contradiction of the law of value that equal amounts of capital *produce* the same amount of surplus-value irrespective of their composition. But it is no contradiction of the law of value that possessors of equal amounts of capital *receive* equal profits if it could be shown that the two capitals have produced different amounts of surplus-value, but that for some reasons, compatible with the law of value, part of the surplus produced by the capital of lower composition was transferred to the owner of the capital with a higher composition. This, says Marx, is just what actually happens wherever the law of equal return comes to the surface.

In actual life capitals of different organic composition *produce* different rates of surplus-value commensurate with the amounts of variable capital contained in them. But we have already seen before that the whole surplus-value produced by any given capital is not retained by the owner of that capital as profit on his capital. We have seen that, by reason of the social nature of capitalistic production and of the category of exchange-value, this surplus-value is distributed among a number of other capitalists, who are concerned in bringing the produced commodity to its social destination through the circulation process. All the

capitals employed in the course of the life-career of the commodity share in the surplus-value created in its production, and their share is proportionate to their size, the rate of profit for each being arrived at by a division of the surplus-value with the aggregate amount of capital used in the production and circulation of the commodity. This is accomplished through the laws of supply and demand by means of the category which we have called Price of Production, and at which commodities are actually, sold at certain stages of their existence instead of at their values.

We have seen already that it is in accordance with the laws of value as understood by us that commodities are not always sold at their values, (indeed, they seldom or never are so sold,) are, in fact, habitually sold at prices other than their values, by reason of and under certain economic conditions; and that a capitalist may, and under certain conditions usually does, receive as profits on his capital surplus-value created by some capital other than his own. The price of production at which commodities are sold at a certain stage of their existence is always below their value; and the capitalists engaged in the circulation of commodities exclusively, the merchants, get as profits on their capital surplus-value not produced by them but merely *realized* by them. The capitalists who produced this surplus-value are forced to divide up with them by the very economic conditions which permit them to retain their own proportionate share.

This principle, which we have heretofore examined with relation only to one sphere of production, must be extended to all the spheres of production wherein the law of equal return prevails. Where the law of equal return prevails in spheres of production wherein the capital employed is of different organic compositions, the prices at which the commodities are finally sold are not their actual values, but a sort of modified Prices of Production which *may* be either above or below their value, and which *will* be above their value in the branches of industry with a capital whose organic composition is above the average, and below their value in the branches of industry with a capital whose organic composition is below the average. Just as in the single commodity the surplus-value produced by one capital had to be distributed among all the capitals engaged in its production and circulation, so here the various amounts of surplus-value produced in the different spheres of production must be distributed ratably among the whole social capital or that part thereof which enters into the equalization process, that is, of those branches of industry where the law of equal return prevails. The whole social capital is regarded as one and the whole amount of surplus-value

produced in the different spheres of production is distributed ratably among the different individual capitals, by the formation of the price of production, and the goods in each branch of industry being sold according to that price of production which will consist of the value of its cost of production together with a share of profit out of the general fund of surplus-value in proportion to the size of the capital employed in its production and circulation. By means of this price of production the excess of surplus-value above the average rate produced in one sphere of production, by reason of the low organic composition of the capital employed in that sphere, will be transferred to that sphere of production wherein the amount of surplus-value produced is below the average, by reason of the high organic composition of its capital. In those branches of industry whose organic composition of capital corresponds with the average or social composition of capital, commodities will be sold at their values, their prices of production will coincide with their values; in those branches whose organic composition is above the average, the Prices of Production will be above their values in proportion to the composition of their capital; and in the branches whose composition is below the average the prices of production will be proportionately below their values.

The appearance in 1894 of the third volume of *Capital* created a sensation in interested circles. While it does not stand in any direct relation with the Revisionist movement, it can hardly be denied that it made its formal argumentation more plausible. The solution of the Great Contradiction contained in the third volume and the rest of the matter therein contained and intimately connected with this solution, opened the door for no end of discussion as to the relation between the first and third volumes of *Capital*. So that the problem to many has turned into the question how to reconcile the supposedly opposed doctrines taught in these two volumes of Marx's life work. The Great Contradiction, in the opinion of many, was not solved, but extended so as to embrace the whole Marxian theory. This was confidently asserted by all the opponents of Marxism, who drew breath. It was heralded from one end of their camp to the other, and it took its classic form in Böhm-Bawerk's, "Karl Marx and the Close of his System." The opponents of Marx were not, however, alone in this opinion. The discussion which has continued until the present day has shown that a good many Marxists, of different shades of Orthodoxy, shared in this view. So much so, that a Russian Marxist of some prominence and of strict orthodox profession of faith, being unable to reconcile the doctrines laid down in the two volumes, respectively, denied, in

his desperation, the genuineness of the "unfortunate" third volume! He claimed that because the third volume was published long after his death, and was compiled from unfinished manuscripts and random notes, Marx appears there as saying things which he really never intended to say and which are in crass contradiction to his real views which are contained only in the first volume. Engels' preface to the third volume is sufficient to show the absurdity of this assertion. So that there was the great contradiction, which made plausible the assertion that Marx completely *abandoned* his own theory of value, laid down by him in the first volume, and returned to the theory of the cost of production of the economists dubbed by him "vulgar." The half-and-half Marxists, à la Bernstein, would not go so far, (timidity and eclecticism being their specialty,) and they tried to minimize the discrepancies between the first and third volumes, claiming that Marx did not abandon his theory of value as laid down in the first volume, but merely *modified* it, on second thought, in the natural course of the *evolution* of his theory. Modification by evolution, or evolution in modification became their favorite theme.

In discussing Marx's philosophico-historic views we already had occasion to refer to this favorite theme of Revisionism. The burden of the song is that Marx's theoretical ideas had passed through an evolutionary process, the main tendency of which was from "unscientific" hard and fast monistic dogmas, at the outset, to mild and loose eclectic "science" at the conclusion. This they applied equally, and with equal justification to the whole Marxian theoretical system, to his historico-philosophic and his economic theories alike, although they failed to grasp the inner relation between these theories. Their lack of discrimination proved to be their undoing. If they had stuck to Marx's historico-philosophic views alone, they might have been able to hold their ground, as Marx's views on the subject are not contained in any treatise, are strewn over the whole mass of his writings in a more or less fragmentary condition, and it requires an intimate acquaintance with his theories to see the improbability of this claim. Not so with his economic theories. He went into elaborate discussion of all phases of the question, and the dates of the different manuscripts, with a few unimportant exceptions, are well known. And these testify aloud to the whole world of the absurdity of these assertions. It appears that most of the third volume, and particularly those portions of it which are supposed to modify the first volume, were actually written down by Marx in its present form *before the publication of the first volume!* To speak in the face of that of a *modification*, by Marx, in the third

volume of the doctrines laid down by him in the first is too palpable an incongruity to merit any particular attention. So, and even more so would be the claim of an intentional *abandonment* in the third volume of the theory of value of the first volume in favor of some other theory. We could then well afford to let the matter rest where it is. It is not so, however, with the question of a contradiction between the two volumes. If there really is such a contradiction, and if the doctrine of the third volume is a *virtual* abandonment of the labor theory of value, it makes, of course, very little difference when the different portions of Marx's book were written, or what he thought of one portion when writing the other, except, of course, as an interesting study of a great aberration of an extraordinary mind.

Professor Werner Sombart, the noted German economist, known to English readers through his graceful study "Socialism in the 19th Century," and known particularly to the readers of the REVIEW because of his recent articles on the American Labor movement, opened the discussion on the subject soon after the appearance of the third volume in an essay entitled, "Some Criticism of the Economic System of Karl Marx." In the introductory remarks of that essay Professor Sombart observes that Marx was a "most misunderstood author," and that an intelligent statement of his assertion was the highest duty of a reviewer of his work. Such a statement he undertakes to give, and goes about it very conscientiously. It must be stated, however, that notwithstanding his conscientious efforts and considerable acumen the execution fell short of the design. His conclusion, therefore, that there was contradiction between the first and third volume can not be accepted as final.

According to Sombart the theory laid down in the third volume of Capital is not much different from the traditional theory of the cost of production. This does not conflict, however, with the theory of value expounded in the first volume, for the simple reason that the labor theory of value was never intended by Marx to represent the actual facts, or, as he puts it, "the (Marxian) *value does not reveal itself in the exchange relation* of the capitalistically-produced commodities." Nor does it play any part in the distribution of the yearly product of society. It has no place in real life. Its office is merely that of an aid to our thinking, by means of which we can understand the economic phenomena, and its place is in the mental operations of the economic theorist. In short, "*it is not an empirical but a mental fact.*" Value, thus banished from economic life into the realms of pure thought, can no longer come into conflict with the gross facts of this life. Its existence is none the less real, at least

to the mind of the German scholar who must have been educated on the writings of the great German idealist philosophers.

Aside from the questionable value of such "value," the chief trouble with Sombart's conception of the Marxian "value" is,—that it is not Marxian. Marx never dreamt of banishing his "value" from the real life, from the facts of actual, every-day, economic life. He not only insisted that his theory of value had an application to the actual economic life of capitalist society, but claimed that the laws of value as laid down by him *controlled* that life and *prescribed the course of its development*. He claimed that while Production Prices, and prices in general differed from the values of commodities, they were always *governed* by the laws of value and were dictated, normally, and in the last instance, by these laws. That all deviation of these prices from the actual values, except accidental and temporary, are governed by the very laws of value which are supposed to be infringed thereby. Truly, Marx was "a most misunderstood author."....

We, therefore, agree, for once, with Böhm-Bawerk, that, whatever the merits of Sombart's conception of value, it does not in any way remove the contradiction in the Marxian theory of value as Marx stated it. Assuming, of course, that there is such a contradiction, if Marx intended his theory to represent the actual course of events of capitalistic production and distribution. That there is such a contradiction is assumed, as we have seen, even by some orthodox Marxists, and Marx-critics do not tire of proclaiming the fact. Says Böhm-Bawerk:

"In what relation does this doctrine of the third volume stand to the celebrated law of value of the first volume? Does it contain the solution of the seeming contradiction looked for with so much anxiety? Does it prove "how not only without contradicting the law of value, but even by virtue of it, an equal average rate of profit can and must be created?" Does it not rather contain the exact opposite of such a proof, viz., the statement of an actual irreconcilable contradiction, and does it not prove that the equal average rate of profit can only manifest itself if, and because, the alleged law of value does not hold good?"

"I see here no explanation and reconciliation of a contradiction, but the contradiction itself. Marx's third volume contradicts the first. The theory of the average rate of profit and of the price of production cannot be reconciled with the theory of value. This is the impression which must, I believe, be received by every logical thinker. And it seems to have been very generally accepted. Loria, in his lively and picturesque style, states that he feels himself forced to the "harsh but just judgment" that Marx,

"instead of a solution has presented a mystification." He sees in the publication of the third volume "the Russian campaign" of the Marxian system, its "complete theoretic bankruptcy," a "scientific suicide," "the most explicit surrender of his own teaching," and the "full and complete adherence to the most orthodox doctrine of the hated economists"."

Böhm-Bawerk then quotes with approval the following passage from Sombart: "Most of them (the readers of the third volume) will not be inclined to regard "the solution" of "the puzzle of the average rate of profit" as a "solution;" they will think that the knot has been cut, and by no means untied. For, when suddenly out of the depths emerges a "quite ordinary" theory of cost of production, it means that the celebrated doctrine of value has come to grief. For, if I have in the end to explain the profits by the cost of production, wherefore the whole cumbersome apparatus of the theories of value and surplus-value?"

Slonimski says: "Contrary to all expectations the theory of surplus-value is repeatedly asserted (in the third volume); in reality however denied by its author and replaced by the old theory with all the familiar elaborations on the cost of production as the only regulators of value. The equality of profits is derived from the phantastic assumption that the capitalists amicably decide among themselves the incomes of the different undertakings, by equalizing the sums of surplus value which they separately drew from wage-labor, and that this is accomplished either by way of brotherly arrangement or through competition. As to the special surplus-value for which the rival capitalists fight so mercilessly, why that is lost sight of and plays no part either in the income of the individual capitalist, or in the establishment of the rate of profit, or in the formation of prices."

"After Marx has led us in the course of two volumes through an elaborate analysis by which he sought to prove that surplus-value is produced by hired human labor-power, he turns about and admits that all his laws and formulas are in direct conflict with reality, and cannot be brought into harmony. That surplus-value in the form of profits is yielded by every productive capital as such in equal amount, even though it be used in such a manner that *no wage-laborers are employed thereby*. Instead, therefore, of surplus-value, which we put to the credit of unpaid labor appropriated by the capitalists, we are confronted with the average rate of profits, *which is conditioned neither upon the number of workmen nor upon the degree of their exploitation, nor is it influenced by either.*"

And Masaryk declares: "*De facto* we have in the third

volume the ordinary theory of cost of production, and the law of supply and demand plays the decisive part."

"Bernstein"—says he—"admits the breach between the third and first volumes. Marx has certainly modified his theory. The theory of value of the first volume is incomplete, and therefore vulnerable, without the elaborations of the third volume. Bernstein admits that the first volume offers for the real economic relations a "sea of generalities without any shore," and that the determination of value by the quantity of labor is inadequate; a more specific measure is necessary. Commodities are exchanged not at their value but at their cost of production, the exchange-value of goods is directly determined by competition of capital, and only indirectly by the law of value. I believe that Bernstein correctly judges the Marxian teaching. The third volume speaks only too plainly against the first." And he adds:

"These expressions (of the third volume) show the *general change* in Marx's views. *We have seen* how Marx modified in the third volume his *older* definition of historic materialism—the whole third volume makes also by its tone a different impression than the first. The first volume is not so ripe.... Bernstein attempts another explanation of the contradiction between the *older* and the *newer* doctrines, which contradiction, as we have seen, he unqualifiedly admits."

Yes, "we have seen." We have seen how absurd it is to speak of a modification of the *older unripe* doctrine by the *newer* and *riper* doctrine, when the supposed older doctrine was formulated *after* the supposedly new one.... And this, as Masaryk himself says, applies to *all* of Marx's views, whether historico-philosophic or economic. Yet, its evident absurdity will not deter Marx-critics, particularly of the milder and revisionist sort, from continually repeating this statement.

This, however, by the way. What does interest us just now is the relation of the third to the first volume, incident to Marx's solution of the "Great Contradiction." Singularly enough, most of the Marx-critics are content with merely stating *ex cathedra* their conclusions or assertions that Marx has, in the third volume, "modified" or "abandoned" the theory stated by him in the first volume, that he contradicts it, that he has adopted a new theory, without giving themselves any particular pains to show the reader just how they arrived at these conclusions, or what is the basis of their assertions, except in the most general way. Always excepting the methodical Böhm-Bawerk, who, besides his general remarks, has also particular objections, separately stated and numbered. We shall pay our respects to them in due time, if there is anything left of them after our general discussion.

Before entering, however, upon the discussion of the theoretical questions involved, we must call attention to the circumstance that the *facts* themselves are not in dispute here, but only their interpretation. Notwithstanding the apparently unanimous verdict of the critics that the Marxian theory is on this point "in direct conflict with reality" and "opposed to the facts," there is really no question here of facts, but merely of their interpretation. The phenomenon itself which, as Marx asserts, brings the Marxian law of value in harmony with the law of equal rate of profit, that is to say: the alleged fact that the products of labor in spheres of production with a higher organic composition of capital are sold at higher prices than the products of labor in spheres with a lower composition of capital, this fact itself, we say, is not disputed by the Marx-critics. It is only as to the explanation of this fact that they differ with Marx. Marx's explanation is based, in the main, on the fact, undisputed by his critics, that the same amount of labor results in a product which will be sold for a higher or lower price according to the higher or lower nature of the organic composition of capital in the sphere in which it was employed. The difference between Marx and his opponents is *as to the reason* for this alleged fact. Marx says the reason is that in the spheres with a higher composition of capital commodities are sold above their value and in spheres with a lower composition of capital below their value; and that the additional value included in the higher price of commodities produced in the first sphere is created in the other sphere and is transferred to their possessor by the very sale of commodities produced in the second sphere below their value. With this reasoning his critics disagree, as they undoubtedly have a right to. But they have no right whatever to hide the circumstance that it is their *reasoning* that is opposed to Marx and not the facts. It is a question of logic and not of fact.

Now, as to the logic of the matter. That there must have been some very poor logic used by somebody can easily be seen from the fact that all Marx-critics who agree that Marx in his "riper" judgment abandoned his theory of value, also agree that even the Marx of the riper judgment never knew that he was propounding in the third volume an old and commonplace theory and was abandoning his own theory on the exposition of which he wasted the entire first and second volumes of his life work.

In what does this abandonment consist according to the Marx-critics? Stripped of their verbiage the statements of these critics amount to this: In the first volume Marx said (1) that the value of a commodity depends on the amount of labor necessary for its (re)production, and that such value was the point

around which its price will oscillate; (2) that the profits of the capitalist, therefore, come from the amount of surplus-value created by *his* workingmen; and (3) that the cost of production had nothing to do with the value or price of a commodity or the profits of the capitalists. In the third volume, on the other hand, he admits that (1) the price of a commodity may be, and usually is, permanently fixed at, or oscillates around, a point which is different from its value as measured by the amount of labor necessary for its (re)production; (2) that the amount of profits which a capitalist obtains from his capital does not depend upon the amount of surplus-value produced by his own workingmen; and (3) that the old theory of cost of production as to value, price and profit holds good.

We will discuss the last proposition first, for the reason that it may throw some light on the whole subject.

Marx says nowhere in the third volume that the cost of production of a commodity determines either its value or its price, except to say that the old values which go into its production in the shape of raw material, etc., are reproduced in it and form part of its value and consequently of its price, a proposition which nobody will claim is an innovation of the third volume. Wherein does the "quite ordinary" theory of cost of production of the third volume then consist? Evidently in the theory of the Price of Production developed in the third volume. But has the price of production anything to do with the cost of production? Have the learned critics not been misled by the similarity of terms? Let us see. What is the "ordinary" theory of cost of production? That the value of a commodity is equal to the cost of its production, plus the average rate of profit on the capital invested in its production. Marx's Price of Production consists of the costs of production (that is, of the *value* of the different ingredients which go into the production) plus the average rate of profit on the capital invested in the production process. The two things look so much alike to the uninitiated that one is not surprised to hear Sombart complain that if that is what we were to come to in the end, wherefore the "cumbersome apparatus" of value and surplus-value?

Let us examine the matter a little closer however. A close examination will show, in the first place, that the Marxian cost of production, which forms a part of the Price of Production, is determined by its value according to the labor theory of value, whereas the "ordinary" theory of cost of production has no such determining element. As a result, the "ordinary" cost of production theory revolves in a vicious circle: The value of a commodity is determined by the cost of its production, the cost of its

production is determined by the value of the commodities which go into its production, the value of these commodities is determined by the cost of *their production*, and so on, and so forth, ad infinitum. In other words, the "ordinary" theory of cost of production can no more explain either the value or the price of commodities than a man can pull himself out of the mire by his own bootstraps.

This is not, however, the principal point. The "cumbrous apparatus" of the Marxian theory of value and surplus-value was necessary in order to attain the principal object of the science of political economy, the discovery of the laws governing the production and distribution of profits in the capitalist system. We have already dwelt on this point at length in a former article. And this "cumbrous apparatus" is still necessary; and is still the only means of attaining this object of political economy, all the Marx-critics to the contrary notwithstanding. Neither the ordinary nor any extra-ordinary theory of cost of production even as much as attempts to solve this problem, which is *the problem* of political economy. The theory of cost of production, which even the "Marxist" Sombart places on a level with the Marxian theory, tells us gravely that the value of a commodity is equal to the cost of its production plus "the average rate of profit." But what is this "average rate of profit"? By what is it determined? Where do profits, whether average or non-average, come from?

In vain will the inquirer look to the theory of cost of production for an answer. But these questions are all answered by the Marxian theory, which our astute critics evidently did not begin to understand. The first volume shows the genesis and general laws of profits; the second volume shows the distribution of profits between the different capitalists, instrumental in the production and distribution of commodities, and the influence of the circulation process on profits; and the third volume shows the reciprocal influences of the different spheres of production and distribution of commodities in the whole capitalist system, and the mode of distribution of all the profits netted to the capitalist class among its different members, *the formation of the average rate of profit*.

By reason of the formation of an average rate of profits, the profit of the individual capitalist does not depend on the amount of surplus-value produced by his own workingmen. This, as we have seen, is the second point on which the third volume is supposed to conflict with the earlier volumes. This objection rests on the grossest misunderstanding of the first and second volumes. Marx never said, and could never have said, that every individual capitalist's profits consist of the surplus-value created by

his own workingmen, or that every capitalist pockets *all* the surplus-value produced by his workingmen. Such a statement would be absolutely repugnant to the spirit of the Marxian doctrine as laid down in the *first* volume. The cardinal difference between the Marxian theory of profits and the theories which preceded it, is that according to Marx all profits of the capitalist class are derived from the process of production. It is with the exhaustive elaboration of this doctrine that the first volume is chiefly concerned, and this is supplemented in the second volume by showing the negative implied thereby, — that no profits are created in the circulation process. But Marx certainly knew that profits *are made* by the capitalists engaged in the circulation process. It was this very knowledge that impelled him to write so exhaustively in order to prove that while these capitalists *derive* their profits from the circulation process, they merely realize during this process, and by means thereof, the profits which are created in the form of surplus values during the process of production.

Of course, this could only happen if some of the capitalists get profits *not created* in the form of surplus-value *by their own workingmen*; nay, notwithstanding the fact that their workingmen created no surplus-value whatever, or that they employed no workingmen at all. This, again, could only happen if the capitalists engaged in the production process did not retain all the surplus-value created by their workingmen, but divided them with the capitalists engaged in the circulation process. It is with the explanation of these facts that the first and second volumes are filled. Yet, some Marx-critics evidently missed even this!

This disposes of the proposition placed by us first because of the prominence given to it by Marx-critics. How could all the surplus-value be produced in the production process of commodities and yet part of it realized in the circulation process, if goods are actually sold at their values? If the value of commodities is the point around which their prices oscillate at all stages of their existence, all the surplus-value contained in them must evidently be realized as soon as they are sold by the producer, and unless some new value attaches to them in the circulation process, the capitalist engaged in that process cannot possibly make any profit. Here was a contradiction greater than any that could result from the supposed law of a common rate of profits, assuming that Marx ever did say that the price of commodities will always oscillate around their value. The "solution" of this "Great Contradiction" is that Marx, as we have repeatedly pointed out, never did say any such thing, and the reading of such a thing into Marx is evidently absurd. A care-

ful reading of the first and second volumes of Capital clearly shows that the price of commodities is *governed* by their value, but that it need not conform to it, nor even always oscillate around it. Quite to the contrary. Under given conditions, which are necessary at certain stages of the existence of every commodity, its price will remain constantly away from its value. Always, however, subject to the general laws of value, and by reason of the laws of value. The price formed under these conditions is the Price of Production.

It is generally assumed that the category of the Price of Production is an innovation introduced by Marx in the third volume in an effort to solve the contradiction between the law of value and the law of equal return. This is a mistake. While the term "Price of Production" is first used in the third volume (because there only are all the conditions under which its forms are discussed for the first time) the principle itself is contained in the earlier volumes, and has absolutely nothing to do with the particular problem presented by the question of the equal rate of profits. When Marx came to treat of that problem he simply applied to it a category which already was part of his system as expounded by him in the first and second volumes. The only difference between the category of Price of Production as used in the first and second volumes and as used in the third volume is this: The conditions for the formation of this price discussed in the first two volumes were such as made it always below the value of commodities, whereas the conditions for its formation discussed in the third volume make it possible for the price of production to be either below or above the value of the commodity. But, whether above or below value, whether formed by reason of the average rate of profit or under the conditions described in the first and second volumes, or both, the *price of production is governed by the value of the commodity, and exists by reason thereof and in conformity thereto*. In other words, notwithstanding the fact that prices may, in the capitalist system of production and distribution, be permanently at, or oscillate around, a point different from the value of commodities, the *formation* of these prices, and, consequently, *their movement is governed by the laws of value*.

This ought to be plain to all Marx students. But the trouble with Marx-critics, of the economic branch of his theory, as, with those who treat of his historico-philosophic ideas, is, that they cannot distinguish between the individual and social element and cannot see things in their motion. Because the profit of an individual capitalist does not depend merely on the amount of surplus-value produced by his workingmen, they conclude that the

theory of surplus-value does not explain the profits which the capitalists get under the capitalist system. And because the price of some commodities may *be* more or less permanently above or below their value, therefore, they assert, the law of value governing the formation and movement of prices in the capitalist system is incorrect. They cannot see that before the capitalist could get his profits at any given *general* rate, that rate must have been established in society according to some law; and that before the price could *be* at a certain point, it had to be *put* there by some social law of value. And they cannot therefore see how the individual and statical cases, while apparently deviating from the general laws in their movement, are actually *governed* by them.

To borrow an example from another science, and an "exact" one at that. The critics of the Marxian law of value are exactly in the same situation as would be the critic of the law of gravity, who would declare that law to be false for the reason that bodies do not fall in actual experience in accordance with the rules formulated by it. Indeed, such a critic would be in a better position than the Marx-critics. For, while according to the laws of gravity falling bodies acquire a velocity of 981 centimeters per second, and that irrespective of their nature, form or size, the "facts of experience" prove conclusively that not one body in a million actually falls at that rate, and any child of some intelligence will tell you that the nature, the form, and the size of a falling object, make all the world the difference in the velocity which it can acquire. Yet, the law of gravity is correct when properly understood. And the Marxian law of value is no less correct. But it requires a greater intelligence than that usually displayed by intelligent children, observers of "facts of experience," and some Marx-critics, to understand it properly. Therein lies the whole trouble.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(*To be continued.*)

A Word of Protest.

IS THERE a movement afoot among the different Socialistic parties of the world, especially of Europe, whereby the smaller nations, their Socialistic parties, are to be deprived of their rights within the International Socialist Movement? Do the Socialists of the stronger nations of Europe, viz. stronger numerically, intend to follow the bourgeois classes of these same nations in their centuries long policy of national oppression? Shall the International Socialist Movement cease to be a movement really international? Shall our International Secretariat be only a representation of states, regardless of nations living within their boundaries? Shall our congresses cease to be gatherings of Socialists of all nations? Shall we witness another disruption of the International?

All these questions, and others, come to our mind when we read the latest news of our movement in Europe. At a conference of the European trade unions, held some time ago in Amsterdam, the delegates of the Bohemian unions, contrary to all precedents, were denied a vote; the organized Bohemian workingmen were denied the right of representation, simply because the Bohemian nationality three hundred years ago was deprived of its political independence; for the reason that the Bohemians to-day are compelled to live under the yoke of the Hapsburgs, that their country forms a part of Austria. This is a fact, a grievous fact, but nevertheless a fact. The conference at Amsterdam was a trade union conference, but a great majority of the delegates were Socialists — is their act justifiable? Can fair-minded, unprejudiced Socialists affirm their attitude toward the organized workingmen of Bohemia? I think not.

But according to all signs we are to have more of these tactics for whose introduction the German Socialists of Austria are responsible in so large a measure. The decision at Amsterdam, to all appearances and notwithstanding the fact that it was a trade union conference, was only an opening wedge for a new policy in our movement, a policy that spells internal strife and probably the disruption of our international organization.

Here are the facts: Representatives of all the national Socialistic parties are to assemble in Brussels on the twenty-second day of this month.* This conference, among other subjects of importance, is to consider the question of representation of dif-

* This conference has been postponed.—Ed.

ferent nationalities in our International Bureau and of voting at our international congresses.

Comrade Van Kol, of Amsterdam, has introduced a motion the sense of which is that in the International Bureau only such nations shall be represented as have a state form of their own, viz., according to Comrade Van Kol, those Socialistic parties struggling against a common government shall have a common delegation to the Bureau. Van Kol is preparing also another resolution regarding voting at the international congresses; but that is simply a logical result of his first motion. The situation is such that Comrade Van Kol's notions probably will prevail. There are also other signs of changed tactics regarding oppressed nationalities of which I hope to speak later. Hence this article.

Now, what does all this mean? It means, nothing less and nothing more than that the Bohemian, Polish, Finnish, etc. etc., Social-Democratic parties may lose their right of representation in our International Bureau and at Socialistic congresses. If Van Kol's motion prevails, as it probably will, the International Secretariat would recognize only an Austrian Social Democracy. But such a thing in fact does not exist. The Austrian Social Democracy is simply a union of the German Social Democratic Party of Austria, Bohemian Social Democracy, Polish Social Democracy, etc., etc. All these Social Democratic parties have a right to be represented in the Bureau and at all of our congresses. This is a matter of justice and principle. The German Social Democrats, for instance, cannot represent the Bohemian party as they probably would have to in case Van Kol's ideas are carried into effect. All Socialistic parties, regardless of the state they are living in, are entitled to be directly heard in our international conclaves.

The Bohemian Social Democracy will never abandon this fundamental right. With them it is a matter of principle, but also of strength. The Bohemian Social Democrats have relatively the strongest organization in Austria. They, in fact, have launched the present great revolutionary movement in Austria. They had to lash into action their German comrades who of late are displaying such dangerous diplomatic and Chauvinistic tendencies.

The Bohemians have a grand movement in Europe. They are the dominating force in Bohemian politics. But so have the Poles a fine movement. The same can be said of the Finns, and other nations. The Socialistic parties of these nations never can tolerate the injustice contemplated by Comrade Van Kol. They will, I am sure, resist all such encroachments upon their rights.

But, may I ask, since when do the Socialists deprive of the right of representation in their institutions those nations that are

so unfortunate as to live under the yoke of the ruling classes of another nation? Or do some of our comrades believe in such an anomaly as, for instance, an "Austrian nation"? No real Socialist can stand for a thing of that sort.

In view of such dangerous tendencies it is time to call a halt.

I am inclined to think that the Socialists of America ought to do something in this matter. *Caveant consules!* Let us guard the integrity of the International Socialist Movement!

CHARLES PERGLER.

A Socialist Casuistry.

"They eat, and drink, and scheme, and plod,
And go to church on Sunday;
And many are afraid of God,
And more of Mrs. Grundy."

IT IS "more in sorrow than in anger that I take up my pen to point out some of the fallacies of Comrade La Monte's article in the November number of *Wilshire's Magazine* on "Marxism and Ethics," for I realize that it is very hard even for the revolutionary Marxian to rid himself of all his long cherished habits and ideas. With that part of the article which treats of the scientific explanation of ethical standards no scientific socialist can reasonably find fault; but when La Monte attempts to formulate new "criteria" of conduct, he departs from the Marxian groundwork of facts to founder in the swamp of Ideology.

Exhibit A. :—

"The Marxist absolutely denies the freedom of the will. Every human action is inevitable. 'Nothing happens by chance.' Everything is because it can not but be. How then can we consistently praise or blame any conduct? If one cares to make hairsplitting distinctions, it may be replied that we can not, but none the less we can rejoice at some actions and deplore others. And the love of praise, with its obverse, the fear of blame, has ever been one of the strongest motives to human conduct. It is not necessarily the applause of the thoughtless multitude that one seeks; but in writing this paper, which I know will be misunderstood or condemned by the majority of those who read it, undoubtedly one of my motives is to win the approbation of the discerning few for whose good opinion I deeply care.

"The passengers whose train has come to a standstill on a steep up-grade owing to the inefficiency of the engine, will not fail to greet with a hearty cheer the approach of a more powerful locomotive. In the same way, socialist workingmen, though they know, in the words of the wise old Frenchman, that *comprendre tout, c'est pardonner tout*, or, better yet, that to understand all is to understand that there is nothing to pardon, will not be chary of their cheers to him who is able to advance their cause, nor of their curses upon him who betrays it. And in so doing, they will not be inconsistent, but will be acting in strict

accordance with that law of cause and effect which is the very fundament of all proletarian reasoning; for those cheers and curses will be potent factors in causing such conduct as will speed the social revolution."

In the above quotation our casuist admits that we can not consistently praise or blame any conduct, and yet claims that the Socialist workingmen are consistent in praising certain acts and blaming others, as by so doing they will cause "such conduct as will speed the social revolution. ("Hooray for Morgan, and the Trust magnates!") Does not this position remind us of those Freethinkers, who, while admitting that religions are false, condemn the iconoclasts on the grounds that it is religion that saves mankind from crime?

It is unfortunately true that many of us do "curse" those that we think guilty of acts that are detrimental to our interests, and are given to cheering those that are able to advance our cause, but it is not true that those "cheers and curses" are "potent factors" in causing revolutionary conduct. We are all familiar with the Socialist (?) agitator, who, to win the plaudits of his audience (including his "comrades"), gives a sentimental talk on "Justice," the "rights" of the workers, etc., and, on the other hand, every revolutionary agitator on returning to the "select few" who call him comrade after making a clear-cut talk, is greeted with such remarks as, "you shouldn't tell 'em that yet," "Why, you're an *Anarchist!*" and is generally berated for attacking the "most sacred institutions" of—Capitalism.

Cheers and curses, it is true, have their effect on certain individuals in the Socialist movement who lack the courage to stand their ground regardless of what others may think of them, but such weaklings cannot be of much value to the movement, and are more likely to be found amongst those workingmen who are continually "licking the feet" of certain "Intellectuals" or amongst those who, having attained a position of "leadership" in the movement are afraid to risk the dearly loved "cheers" by taking a revolutionary position in times of crises.

"For praise too dearly loved, too warmly sought,
Enfeebles all internal strength of thought."

Goldsmith's lines are good, but he does not state the case with sufficient strength. Those who would be of real use to the Socialist movement must be prepared, when need arises to stand their ground without any regard for the approval or disapproval, not only of the "thoughtless multitude" but even of the "discerning few" for whose good opinion they may deeply care. At this point many will suggest that one who could be so daring, would be influenced by the belief that in some future time his conduct would be duly rewarded with praises or by the hope that his "grand-children would plant flowers on his grave." This

of course might be the motive, but on the other hand there is in itself a sufficient reward.

It was the love of approbation that led Napoleon to a career of bloodshed, and made him the unconscious tool of the Bourgeoisie.

Again, it may be asked, "Can we define as good, those actions which tend to benefit the human race, and as bad those which tend to have a contrary effect? To accept these definitions as a premise from which to judge conduct would lead us to some truly wonderful conclusions. Take for example the sanguinary conduct of Napoleon. The butcheries of this glory loving genius were at the same time cause and effect. The product of a certain historic condition they were necessary to create a favorable environment for the development of the Bourgeoisie, the development of the Bourgeoisie leads us to modern capitalism which in its turn is the necessary precursor of the Co-operative Commonwealth. This bloodshed then was good if we accept the definition suggested above. As a matter of fact all that we can say is that they were necessary. Those who agree with Comrade La Monte have yet another suggestion, "Can we not judge conduct by the motive that inspires it?" To answer this question in the affirmative is to admit that many of the much-censured "Opportunists" are deserving of the highest praise, for it cannot be denied that many of them are perfectly sincere, and though their Opportunism can generally be traced to some particular class interest or influence, they are consciously inspired by a desire to further the interests of humanity. The well-meaning fool is usually regarded as the most exasperating and troublesome type of humanity.

As for personal affection it can scarcely be said to depend upon the approval or disapproval of conduct. Many of those for whose affection I greatly care, are not Socialists, and, for various reasons strongly disapprove of my taking an active part in the movement, nor do they always approve of my personal conduct, or I of theirs, yet, these facts do not affect their affection for me, nor mine for them. On the other hand many of us have no personal affection for some of those who are with us in thought and action as far as the movement is concerned, and whose personal conduct is irreproachable when judged by conventional standards or by our own. These vagaries (?) of personal feeling can of course be explained, but it is sufficient for our present purpose merely to recognize them.

Comrade La Monte would also have us adopt a Neo-Comstockian method of Dramatic Criticism.

Exhibit B.:—

"But those of us who call Sudermann the first of living

dramatists, do so on account of the extreme nobility of his heroines' conduct judged by the criteria of the future."

So? Artistic standards of taste are to disappear and dramatists must submit to the dictates of a revolutionary Mrs. Grundy. The much lamented "commercialism" in its worst phase could not have a more disastrous effect upon the Dramatic art. For my part I shall continue to judge a Drama as a Drama, a novel as a novel, a poem as a poem, without regard to the conduct of heroes or heroines. Such, I believe, is the usual method of judging an artist's work. The fact that Bernard Shaw in some of his plays gives expression to views of Bourgeois morality in which I acquiesce, does not blind me to the fact that he is, in my opinion, a very indifferent dramatist, judging his work from an artistic standpoint, nor does the fact that Bernard Shaw is, in my opinion, a blackguard, prevent me from rejoicing at his attacks on conventional morality; but I neither blame him for being a blackguard and an indifferent dramatist, nor praise him for attacking the Bourgeoisie. I recognize the facts and prefer to say, with the old Roman playwright Terence, "Man am I, nothing that is human do I count foreign to myself." (The "intellectuals" will pardon me for writing in one language at a time.)

"I have said enough to show that for a Marxian to praise or blame is ridiculous, that so far as the love of approbation is concerned it is as likely to cause deplorable conduct as not, but I must crave the indulgence of my readers while I examine some further fallacies of La Monte's "Criteria."

Exhibit C. :—

"It is because I believe that this love of one's fellows under Socialism will be a joy far exceeding in intensity any pleasure known to us, that I look for dramatic art to reach under Socialism a perfection and influence to-day inconceivable."

I, too, think that the love of one's fellows under Socialism will be a joy far exceeding in intensity any pleasure known to us, and also that the dramatic art, in fact all art, will reach a perfection and influence hitherto unknown and inconceivable. But the love of one's fellows will not, as La Monte would seem to think, be the chief cause of the development of art. Love of one's fellows will of course aid this development, but a greater cause must be sought in the increased opportunities that will be afforded the artists, and most of all in the fact that they will no longer be compelled (as they are to-day for economic reasons) to consider the wishes of others and will consequently be able to put their best effort into their work and will work solely for the joy of artistic creation. As Paul La Fargue has so happily expressed it:—

"The artist then will paint, will sing, will dance, the writer

will write, the musician will compose operas, the philosophers will build systems, the chemist will analyze substances not to gain money, to receive a salary, not to deserve applause, but to win laurel wreaths, like the conquerors at Olympic games, but to satisfy their artistic and scientific passions; one does not drink a glass of champagne or kiss the woman he loves for the benefit of the gallery."ⁿ

That La Fargue has the facts of the case can not be denied, for even to-day those artists and scientists who are most worthy of the name, pay absolutely no heed to the opinions of the Comstockian public.

How, then is the individual to regulate his conduct? The only answer to this question based on the facts is: by striving always to be true to his or her individuality, i. e., to seek the greatest possible pleasure and to avoid pain. It is true that those who so regulate their conduct will be likely to make mistakes, and by this I mean that they will sometimes be guilty (?) of conduct that will cause both themselves and their fellows pain. But this is far more true of those whose conduct is regulated by other methods. While it can not be denied that the love of approbation has ever been and yet is one of the strongest motives to human action, the idea that it always will be can only be evolved from the brain of an "Intellectual" trying to console himself for his coming political downfall with the hope of retaining his supposed academic superiority. For is it not reasonable to suppose that under Socialism the fact that every human act is inevitable will be even more generally known than the law of gravitation is to-day? Knowing that nothing "happens by chance" men will know that no human act is deserving of praise or blame, and an examination of the facts will show that the effect of praise or blame on human character is more likely to be pernicious and weakening than salutary and strengthening and therefore they will neither praise nor blame individuals for their conduct. Scientists recognize facts and facts alone. The facts, it must be admitted, give no ground on which to praise or blame conduct. "To do thy will, enjoy sweet life," will no longer be "vice." It is well for the liberati of the Socialist movement to bear in mind the advice of Carlyle to Tom Taylor. "Just say what you think, but first find out just what you do think, if that be practicable," and above all things they should stick to the *facts*.

WALLIS ROBERTS.

Wichita, Kansas.

* "Socialism and the Intellectuals," by Paul La Fargue.

EDITORIAL

Socialists and Government Ownership.

With the approaching municipal campaigns nearly every socialist local in the country is busy discussing the attitude to be taken toward the wave of municipalization and nationalization that is just now sweeping over the country. To a large extent this problem is peculiarly American. The socialist parties of all other countries have always been friendly toward such movements and all contain demands for municipalization in their platform. To be sure this is always done without in any way claiming these as essential parts of socialism. In the United States, however, there are some socialists who have declared their bitter hostility to all efforts to extend the functions of nation, state or municipality, while these remain in the hands of capitalist parties. They have made this attitude a test of orthodoxy. No matter what a person's belief may be in other directions, if he favors municipal ownership of street cars he is a traitor to socialism. He may accept a national platform like that of the Socialist Labor party containing all the platitudes of middle class philosophy from "natural rights" to a "purpose" in government and still be an orthodox Marxian socialist, but if he insinuates that government ownership of railroads might not be a crime against the working class he becomes a "middle class muddle head" at once.

To be sure this position is not quite so ridiculous as this bare statement indicates. There is a modicum of method in the madness. This is the only country in which these questions have been made the political creed of a radical middle class movement.

In England and Germany states and cities have taken over industries purely for military or administrative purposes. In many cases these steps were taken by conservative parties. The Russian autocracy has gone as far as any country in the world in the extension of governmental functions. In England the ownership of docks and the municipalization of industries often finds strong support from the old landed aristocracy. In this country on the contrary this movement has always been attached to radicalism and has been generally urged as a step toward socialism.

It has become one phase of the small capitalist revolt which is filling our magazines with the "literature of exposure."

This class of small exploiters see in municipalization and nationalization a hope of curbing the power of the great capitalist class and thereby gaining for themselves a momentary foothold on the backs of the workers. La Follette, Dunne, Hearst, and numerous politicians are seeking to ride into power upon this sentiment. There is no doubt whatever about the fact that this movement is going to play a great part in American politics during the next four or five years. As a consequence there seems to be a sort of stampede among the socialists in two directions. One faction demands that we climb into the band wagon or rather that we insist upon our right to lead the procession; the other would have us confine our efforts to throwing bricks at the participants as they pass by.

Perhaps if we pause long enough to consider what are the actual functions of the Socialist party we shall be better able to solve this problem. From the very beginning and in all countries it has been thoroughly recognized that the first and foremost fundamental purpose of the whole socialist movement is the organization of the working class into a compact revolutionary body ready to conquer the position of social rulership. All else must give way to this purpose. Every platform, method of organization, question of tactics must meet this test: "Will it further or retard the solidarity of a class conscious revolutionary proletariat?" No momentary gain, no reform, no "first step" is of sufficient importance to justify such a use of the party organization as will sow the seeds of disintegration, relax the bond of coherence, or obscure its revolutionary attitude.

These reasons must always prevent any use of the party as such for the attainment of municipal ownership, initiative and referendum, etc., whenever such use will involve the advocacy of such measures to such an extent as to bring into the organization members not fully in accord with the main purpose of the party, or which shall tend to confuse that purpose in the minds of those who are already members. We can never afford, for instance, to "make a campaign" on the question of municipal ownership. Our educational work and propaganda must never be permitted to center around anything less than the complete conquest of public power by the socialists. It must be remembered that even collectivism is after all but a method of using proletarian power when once gained. Whether every tool and every instrument of production shall be socialized or not is a question on which there may well be differences of opinion, and which can only be settled when the workers are in power and by the workers of that time. But there never can be any question for socialists as to whether the working class or capitalist class ought to rule in society. To suggest that the socialist party desires to serve any other class even momentarily is treason to the principle of socialism. Since, so long as the class struggle exists any such interests must be antagonistic to the working class cause and therefore any attempt to

further them will have the age old result of every attempt to serve two masters.

There is a need in the socialist movement to-day of a revival, not of the phrases of the old class conscious revolutionary socialism, but of a knowledge of what those phrases mean. The phrases have been worn out and very frequently by those who knew little of their need.

Our present party organization shows some dangers of falling into the hands of non-working-class members. We would be the last to raise any test of occupation within the membership of the socialist party and have always denounced all such attempts in the past. Nevertheless we can not but feel that those positions which have anything to do with determining policy and tactics should so far as possible be filled with men who have not lost touch with the actual class struggle of shop and factory.

There will always be a pendulum-like swing from one side to the other in any rapidly growing movement. There is no need to grow frightened because of these movements, because the class struggle is the one great fact around which a socialist movement must center just as according to Marxian economics the amount of labor crystallized in any article constitutes the norm around which the market price must always vary. But it is easily possible that at times this variation from the class struggle point of view may become so great that it will require so violent a movement to bring the party activity back to its proper position as to partially disrupt our organization. For these reasons continuous watchfulness is essential. Eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty, it is also the only requisite of constant progress.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

ENGLAND.

For the moment the center of socialist interest has been transferred to the British Isles. England, at once the classic land of capitalism, and also the classic land from which to draw illustrations by the enemies of socialism of the slowness of revolutionary thought to develop, has at last shown signs of redemption. In spite of the proverbial cleverness of the English rulers, which never found a better illustration than when a dissolution of Parliament was preceded by the formation of a Liberal cabinet, containing that traitor to the working class, John Burns, as one of its members, and with a program promising relief to the unemployed and abolition of convict labor on the Rand,—yet in spite of these clever tactics, the result showed that a portion at least of the working class of England could be fooled no longer. The complete returns of the election shows nearly fifty labor members elected. The following is a partial list of these members and the organizations to which they belong:

Social Democratic Federation—Will Thorne.

Independent Labor Party—J. Keir Hardie, George Barnes, Philip Snowden, J. R. MacDonald, J. R. Clynes, J. Parker, H. H. Jowett.

Independent Socialists—George Lansbury.

Labor Representation Committee—G. D. Kelley, A. H. Gill, J. J. Jenkins, J. O'Grady, G. H. Roberts, J. T. MacPherson, T. F. Richards, Will Crooks, Charles Duncan, T. Glover, G. J. Wardle, W. Hudson, Alex. Wilkie, S. Walsh, C. W. Bowerman.

A few words of explanation as to the character of working class organization in England are necessary to an understanding of the present situation. Three bodies were represented in the election. The first is the Social Democratic Federation, the oldest socialist body in England, based upon the Marxian doctrines, and in general standing upon practically the same lines as the Socialist Party of the United States. Besides this the Independent Labor Party is also an avowed socialist body largely opportunist in its outlook. The Independent Labor Party in connection with the Trades Unions and some minor socialist organizations constitutes the Labor Representation Committee. This body has no platform and only requires as condition of endorsement that the candidate shall pledge himself to become a member of an independent "labor group" in the house of Commons independent from the Liberal and Conservative Parties. Many of the men so elected are sympathetic with the socialist movement, other are almost antagonistic. The S. D. F. was originally a member of the L. R. C., but withdrew when that body refused to accept the class struggle as a principle of action. There is one phase of the election which especially deserves comment. Comrade H. M. Hyndman, by

far the foremost socialist in the English speaking world to-day, stood for Burnley. From the beginning he stood on a clear cut socialist platform. He received no endorsement from any "labor" body whatever. He had the honor of being the most fiercely fought man in the whole British Kingdom. Not only did he have the regular Conservative and Liberal opponents, but when it became evident that these could not be elected the country was ransacked to find a labor leader so lost to all sense of decency as to permit himself to be used as an opponent. This man was found in one F. Maddison, who was finally elected by a vote of 5,288 to Comrade Hyndman's 4,932 votes, the Conservative candidate polling 4,964. It is significant that when in 1895 Comrade Hyndman ran in the same district he only received 1,498 votes. It is not an exaggeration to say that more forces of capitalism were probably concentrated against him than were ever brought together against one man before. These included not only the Liberal and Conservative and renegade labor forces already described, but the Salvation Army and the Catholic Church, who joined hands in this battle, to say nothing of the introduction of the direct use of bribery something not common in English elections.

MEXICO.

From our correspondent in Mexico, who for reasons already explained in these columns dares not permit his name to be known, we learn that once more the fire of socialism is being kindled in that country. He writes that "practically no socialist literature has ever fallen into the hands of the working class of Mexico and consequently they know little or nothing about the doings of working class political parties in other countries. But the conditions of life that make Socialists are here in great abundance. In short, where Capitalism *is*, Socialism *will be*. Less than a year ago a socialist spark became visible in this city, (Guadalajara) as if from spontaneous combustion. A few minds had shaken off the thralldom of religious fanaticism and had discovered the beautiful theories of socialism. A small paper began to be published, "El Obrero Socialista," under the direction of Senor Roman Morales, assisted by a small but resolute group of comrades. Later they organized "Lea Liga Socialista de Guadalajara" which holds regular weekly meetings. Yesterday being the first anniversary of "Red Sunday" in Russia, this league held a special meeting last night to commemorate the event. There was music and speeches. The hall was decorated with the national colors of Mexico and red flags. On the walls were shields bearing the names and nationality of some of the world's most prominent socialists and friends of labor: among which I recall "Father" Gapon, Maxim Gorki, Karl Marx, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Enrico Ferri, Frederick Engels, Jean Jaures, Emile Vandervelde, Tom Mann, Pablo Iglesias, Ella Wheeler Wilcox, and "Mother" Jones. The meeting was the first *public* socialist gathering ever held in this Republic. It passed off without police interference and was a success in every way. The spark has become a flame and I believe that no power will be able to prevent the formation of a national socialist political party in this country in the near future. The Mexican proletariat is beginning to realize the sublime idea of international working class solidarity."

RUSSIA.

The news columns of the capitalist press of America would have us believe that the Russian revolution was over with and that the workers were crushed. Their financial columns, however, belie this story with their continuous tale of the downward course of the Russian bonds. The

European papers also recognize that the revolution has really only begun and that Moscow was but one of the first battles. The returning soldiers from Siberia are bringing back new recruits for the revolutionary movement. The Caucasus district is practically in the hands of the revolutionists, while the crushing out of the Moscow revolution is still occupying 30,000 troupes,—quite a respectable army to be used in quelling what we are assured is already dead. This army is carrying out a campaign of murder and rapine of the most hideous character. Stories of the killing of whole bodies of troupes, the shooting down of women and children are continually leaking through. At the same time the revolutionists have taken up terrorist tactics and official after official is falling a victim to the individual warfare.

SPAIN.

The recent legislative elections in Spain showed a falling off in the socialist vote, which was 26,000 in 1903, to 15,000. The socialists, however, state that this is in no way an indication of a decline of socialist strength, but is due to various causes wholly apart from the growth of socialism. Among these is the fact that many agricultural workers were prevented by force from casting their votes and that the terrible industrial crisis has created great armies of unemployed who have either emigrated, wandered about the country until they have lost the right to vote, or were herded in despairing mobs in the cities too weak and dispirited to even take an interest in their own emancipation.

SWITZERLAND.

According to a review of the Swiss socialist movement, which appears in the Berlin *Vorwaerts*, the past year has been one of steady rapid growth. Owing to the unfair method of districting, however, the socialist party with 100,000 votes only succeeded in electing 38 representatives, while the radical party with twice as many votes has 103 representatives. One of the most active features of the campaign of the recent year has been in opposition to the use of the militia against strikers, something that it might be well for those who are advocating the Swiss system in this country to observe. There have been an extraordinarily large number of strikes during the past year and the industrial movement is growing rapidly.

FRANCE.

For the first time in the history of France two socialist senators have been elected. Owing to the indirect method of election and the property qualifications the socialists have hitherto found it impossible to enter the senate. Even those who were elected are of the opportunist wing and secured their place only through compromise with the radical party.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

In discussing trade union conditions with Secretary Frank Morrison, of the A. F. of L., a few weeks ago, the latter declared that the movement had been practically at a standstill during the past two years, but thought that this year progress will become marked through a general revival. A day or two following Thomas I. Kidd, formerly a vice-president of the Federation, dropped in and the labor situation was again from the organization standpoint. "Our union (the woodworkers) lost ground," said Mr. Kidd, "along with many others. The butchers, iron and steel workers, garment workers, hotel and restaurant employees and quite a few others have had considerable of a decrease in membership. But we will have to make the best of it and renew our efforts to strengthen our lines." The next day a general organizer of an international union blew in and said: "I am unable to account for the lethargy among the rank and file of workers. I just came up through the South and the conditions are anything but satisfactory. Many of our locals in that section have gone to pieces, and it looks as though we have not yet reached rock bottom. The demands of Southern union officials for more general organizers are perfectly justified and I understand that President Gompers will visit that section in person and look over the ground. But it will require more than his magic presence to reorganize the workers down there." The labor papers also speak in discouraging tones, and reports of state bureaus of labor, state federations and city central bodies all indicate that the slump during recent months has been real and is by no means at an end. It is a fact that there is no apparent reason for the decrease in membership that seems to be general when comparisons are made with former years of industrial activity. Work has been fairly plentiful in all the trades and wages have remained stationary. At least there have been no general reductions, and in some crafts there were slight advances. At the Pittsburg Federation convention I questioned some of the national officers regarding this matter, and, as a rule, they frankly admitted that they were unable to account for the depression. Not even the Socialists were held responsible for the existing lethargy by those delegates who were in daily touch with the rank and file. On the contrary, one of the national officers of the miners surprised me by declaring that if it were not for the constant agitation of the Socialists among them their organization would not be in as good shape as it is at present. This same official also made the astonishing statement that the majority of the national executive board of the United Mine Workers are Socialists or lean strongly toward that side of the fence, and backed up this information by preparing a list of the board members and giving their political preferences as he understood them. Now while Gompers and his ultra-conservative followers have at-

tacked the Socialists at every opportunity, and have duly noted and not infrequently also magnified every little local 'scrap' in which the red button fellows may have been mixed, it is true, and they know it, that generally the country over, in large cities and small towns, the Socialists in the trade unions have been and are now the most active and aggressive workers for organization, irrespective as to whether or not they are in the minority and are compelled to dodge the blacklist whip of the capitalists and receive the sneers of the Gompersites for their pains. The thing that is ailing the American trade union movement is the fossilized policy of its officialdom that leads nowhere. In every civilized country in the world organized labor seems to have some goal, some ideal, to struggle toward—everywhere but in America. Here we have the petrified sameness, like boarding house hash, over and over again, and then some more. Gompers and his crowd were quick to claim the credit for the rapid growth of the unions a few years ago; now let them bear the odium of retrogression. The fact is, beginning with the new century, the unions grew in membership and power because of economic pressure and in spite of Gompers and his reactionary ideas. Gompers had no more to do with forming new unions in Chicago, New York, Cleveland or any other place than the child unborn. He knew nothing about them until reports were sent in from international officials, who also, as a rule, had little or nothing to do with organized local unions except to attach their John Hancock and the official seal to the charter. In most instances the unions were formed by obscure local organizers who are attached to city central bodies, who work at their trades all day and then spend their evenings in attempting to improve the conditions of their fellowmen. These voluntary organizers are the backbone of the American labor movement. While they do the practical work Gompers poses and squints sideways for bouquets and boasts of the success of the movement under his administration. If a strike is won, he announces loudly all about what "we" have done. If a strike is lost, Sam forgets about it. Just for illustration: President Gompers was reported as preparing to go South and rally the labor hosts about the A. F. of L. standard. He will do nothing of the sort. Mr. Gompers wrote a prominent union official in Atlanta, under date of December 30, that he regrets more than words can express that it is absolutely impossible for him to make his organizing and lecturing trip through the South. Why? Because the International Typographical Union was engaged in the eight-hour struggle. "Of course," says he, "it is true that I am not in charge of the strike," says he. "but," says he, "you can readily appreciate how intensely interested I am in it and for its successful consummation," says he, and a lot more along the same line. Mr. Gompers surely takes himself seriously. He has had less to do with the strike than the most obscure printer in Alaska. But it was a golden opportunity to get near the centre of the stage, and watch him at Minneapolis! Lynch, Bramwood and the I. T. U. officers who directed the fight from beginning to end, and who sweat blood while the suave Samuel puffed cigars and looked wise, will be completely eclipsed. It was this unseemly haste to push himself to the fore and claim all the credit that was lying around loose that disgusted the miners three years ago and started them on a still hunt looking for his scalp, and if Duncan, first vice-president, had not displayed a yellow streak at the critical moment the latter would have been advanced to the presidency.

The truth of the matter is Gompers can arouse no enthusiasm among the rank and file. As a rule, his mass meetings are a failure, not because the workers feel any personal ill will toward our worthy president, for as an individual Sam is a fine old fellow, but for the reason that he bears no message, offers no program, speaks platitudinously, and lets

it go at that. The radicals, who are always the life of a community, are not attracted and the slow poke conservatives are indifferent. The revolution of labor-saving machinery, the centralization of capital and modern business methods, and all the daily developments in social, economic and political life teach Gompers nothing. The action of the workers in every civilized country in the world in marshaling their forces at the ballot-box as class-conscious armies to capture the powers of government and change them from instruments of exploitation and oppression into means of establishing liberty and justice is meaningless to Gompers who seems to be equally at home at fraternizing and momentarily shining at the festal board of the civic Federation or down on his knees before corrupt politicians begging for labor laws that are not forthcoming.

It should not be understood that Gompers is all-powerful in the Federation. I have said before, and repeat it now, that if his election were submitted to referendum vote he would be defeated with ease. Gompers' strength consists in being surrounded by a fairly strong ring of national officers who are no more progressive than he; in the inability of the opposition to centralize on some candidate who could defeat him, and, finally, in the undesirability of influential men to accept the presidency of the A. F. of L., which carries no power with it, and they would hesitate to make the huge bluffs that Gompers does to keep themselves in the public eye. Yet the position, from the standpoint of moral influence, could be made an important one through the inauguration of a campaign of education that would assist materially in starting the masses moving forward. It has been stated, and in a sense truly, that the rank and file are responsible for Gompers and that he reflects their views. But the union membership is no more responsible for Gompers than the voters of New York are for Senator Depew, and there are those among us who deny that he expresses the hopes and aspirations of the great working class of this country. He is a leader along a straight and narrow path who leans backward and holds in check those behind, and takes no progressive step unless he is pushed along. And so by mere sentiment, with little or no actual power, like the governor of a state who has no veto power, Gompers is doing his utmost to enervate the labor movement. Dissatisfaction is heard on every hand; good men are dropping out of the ranks because no progress is being made, and it is becoming a serious problem to keep the active workers in the field. "Organize," they say, "yes; but then what? Strike and boycott against the constantly growing power of capitalism—pit our stomachs against bags of money? Some new and better way must be devised." But after the Pittsburg farce there is little likelihood that the A. F. of L., as conducted at present, will take the initiative to popularize any new idea. Had the capmakers' resolution been adopted and a commission been appointed to investigate the desirability of taking political action, in time we might have gotten as far as the British trade unionists are, whom we pretend to imitate. But not even that small crumb of comfort was conceded to the radicals. Fact is, political thought and discussion, except of the begging sort, was tabooed, for the present at least. It is to be hoped that at the Minneapolis convention next November the sweet dreams of the fossilized element will not be disturbed by any thought of rantankerous invasion from Socialists. Just what any Socialist can want at the next reunion of ultra-conservative "labor leaders" who are ambitious to gain the approving smiles of the capitalistic powers that be is problematical. The thing to do is to permit the reactionists of every stripe to have full swing, and there is no law that I know of to prevent the progressive elements, those who favor political action, from holding an informal conference at some convenient

point some time during the year and deciding upon a live action to improve the trade union movement. No individual or set of individuals own the trade unions—at least not yet.

During the past two years it has been hinted from time to time that the Parry-Post union-smashers were elaborating a scheme to organize a standing army of strike-breakers to be utilized whenever and wherever necessity demanded it. The plan included securing control of men and women in every trade and paying them a bonus over and above the wage rates for which the unions were struggling in a contest between labor and capital. During normal conditions the scabs are to be provided with employment at prevailing rates of wages, or if there are no jobs they are to be kept on the pay roll just the same. Pension schemes, vacations, etc., have been suggested as bait, calculated to attract and hold the unwary and ignorant workers or those among them who have no conscience and can be purchased for the usual thirty pieces of silver. It is now given out that the plan has matured quite fully, and that preparations have been made by the union-smashing capitalists to meet the possible attacks of organized labor at every important industrial point in the United States. Employment bureaus have been established in every large city, with a central office in New York, and the Parryites claim that they have fully 180,000 idle men registered in the various bureaus who are ready to go anywhere to work. Only a picked few among this army will be carried on the pay roll. The others are expected to remain loyal to their masters by the promises of good situations when trouble comes. Whether this plan will work out as its promoters expect remains to be seen. "The schemes of mice and men gang aft alee."

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHANGING ORDER, A STUDY OF DEMOCRACY, by Oscar Lovell Triggs. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 300 pages, \$1.00.

The central thought of this book is summed up in the statement that "philosophical monism, social democracy, characteristic art, and the corresponding aesthetics are parts of one stupendous social movement." In developing this thesis, the author shows how each and every form of art has grown out of the industrial conditions amid which it lived and has stood in close relation to the entire social life of its age. The perfection of form of the Greeks, the romantic mysticism of the middle ages, the scientific trend of capitalism and finally the democracy springing from the growing revolutionary movement of the workers each have wrought corresponding changes in art, literature and music. To-day, in response to the democratic tendency, art and industry are being united in the play idea, with the possibility of its application to every day life through the beautifying of all production.

The four chapters on "The Philosophy of Play," "Democratic Education," "The Work Shop and School," and "A School of Industrial Art" make one of the most valuable discussions of the new philosophy of education that has yet appeared. Here it is shown how by the application of the "play principle" education may be made attractive, interesting, and in combination with industrial training, with universal application, be made democratic and suited to a new society. The whole book is permeated with the philosophy of Whitman and Morris. Its reading by a man of artistic training should be sufficient to make him a socialist. At one place the author expresses a disbelief in the efficacy of political action by the laborers, adopting a somewhat anarchistic position, but he does this only in a suggestive manner without argument and we believe that further investigation would satisfy him that the workers can by no means afford to neglect the ballot as a means of attaining the ends set forth in the book, and indeed that it is one of the most effective means to that end. Aside from that the work is on the whole in accord with the principles of the international socialist movement.

The author does not stop with the purely theoretical side of this subject. He goes on to show how the "sociological view point in art can be practically applied in education by the union of the work shop and the school, permeated with the play idea." Tolstoi and William Morris are studies as showing phases of the evolution of the new idea, and the work closes with a chapter on "The Outlook to the East" pointing out the influence of Oriental art and life and its relation to present day problems.

The book is an extremely valuable addition to the literature of socialism, whose reading will give a new and wider view-point to the average socialist worker.

BETTER-WORLD PHILOSOPHY, A SOCIOLOGICAL SYNTHESIS, by J. Howard Moore. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 275 pages, \$1.00.

The author of this book is the instructor in zoology in the Crane Manual Training High School, Chicago, and approaches his problem from the point of view of biological monism. He studies man as a "being of desires," traces the process by which he has conquered his environment, first in the tooth and claw struggle as an animal and then later with all the marvelous tools which distinguish him from the rest of the animate universe. Slowly man has come to realize that the universe is controlled by law and that there are no accidents or causeless happenings. "The ideal relation of the inhabitants of the universe to each other is that relation which will aid most actively in the satisfaction of the desires of the universe." Bearing that principle in mind, he then proceeds to discuss the possibility of attaining this ideal, with the various problems which arise in connection with man's relation to his inanimate environment and to mankind. His chapter on "Race Culture" is especially suggestive to those who have become impressed with the ideas circulated in the conventional world and clustering around the concept of race suicide. He shows how by the application of biological principles of selection through alteration of the environment any sort of race desired can be produced. Those who are cast out by present society may or may not be the fittest to survive in the sense of being the most desirable for race purposes:

"A very large percentage of criminals are the victims of industrial conditions. They were driven to their deeds by economic impalement. Unable to conquer a livelihood on account of the preempted condition of opportunities and the finiteness of their own powers, they chose violence as a last horrible resort. If they had not been endowed with an instinct to live, they might have lain down peacefully and passed away, if they could have found some monopolist gracious enough to allow to them six feet of his dominions as a ceasing-couch. But being, like other sons of mortals, too fastidious to rot, they did the only thing possible to avoid it. When men, capable and eager, traverse the land in sad-eyed armies, season after season, seeking opportunity to earn honest nutrition, and seeking in vain for even the ravellings of existence, the marvel is, that they are so patient—the marvel is, that they do not in an epileptic of despair leap at the throat of society, and exact from its rich jugulars that which the simplest justice adjudicates to them."

The work is written in a delightfully clear and simple style which makes it a strikingly agreeable contrast to most works dealing with this subject matter.

THE GREATEST TRUST IN THE WORLD, by Charles Edward Russell. The Ridgeway Thayer Co. Cloth, 252 pages, \$1.50.

This is a contribution to the great "literature of exposure" so characteristic of the present. It is a strongly written discussion of the beef trust with its private cars, stockyards, distributing stations and general control over this portion of the food of the world. "Here is something compared with which the Standard Oil is puerile; here is something that affects a thousand lives where the Standard Oil affects one; here is something that promises greater fortunes and greater power than the Standard Oil Companies." The Beef Trust has by means of its refrigerator car system and its tremendous capital been able to dominate, not simply the meat business, but all industries concerned with perishable commodities. The tribute levied upon the fruit and vegetable trade stops only at the point where these commodities would no longer reach the mar-

ket. Other business has been swept aside with the ruthlessness which has always marked commercial warfare until there is a long row of "notches on the trust's knife-handle." It has used state and national governments whenever they were needed, almost as handily as it has manipulated its packing-houses. All this is told with a strong, almost sensational style, the dramatic points well developed so as to make a good "story" in the journalistic sense. On the whole it is written from the stand-point of the small capitalist and professional man. There is nothing concerning the condition of the laborers who do the work, no word of the effect of concentration in fixing wages. The chapter on "Possible Cures for a Huge Evil" is almost silly, the whole discussion culminating in its demand for legislation against rebates. As if the same financial powers were not controlling railroads and beef-trust alike, and government to boot.

THE END OF THE WORLD, by Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Margaret Wagner, Chas. H. Kerr & Co., Chicago.

"We seem to exist in a hazardous time,
Driftin' along here through space;
Nobody knows just when we begun
Or how fur we've gone in the race.
Scientists argy we're shot from the sun,
While others we're going right back,
An' some say we've allers been here more or less,
An' seem to establish the fact
O' course 'at's' somemin' 'at nobody knows,
As far as I've read or cun see;
An' them as does know all about the hull scheme,
Why, none of 'em never agree."

These homely but genial verses of Ben King were suggested to me by Dr. Meyer's interesting essay entitled *The End of the World*. It is not that there is anything flippant or superficial in the author's treatment of his subject but there is a contagious cheerfulness about his manner of reviewing the possibilities of sudden or slow world dissolution which almost provokes a smile. It is curious to observe the effect produced by the same data upon men of differing temperaments. Mr. W. H. Mallock contemplates the extinction of the human race and becomes a profound pessimist. Dr. Meyer views the entire panorama of ceaseless change throughout the universe and finds in it only a confirmation of his optimism. Nature, according to him, destroys only to upbuild in grander style. This seems to me to be a far reaching conclusion not justified by our present imperfect knowledge of cosmic phenomena. Is it not more true to the facts in the case to conceive of the cosmos as in a state of constant equilibrium in which the forces that make for evolution and dissolution balance each other? Still, for us, it remains also true that our planet has not passed beyond the stage of earliest youth. Our author suggests this and the further probability that millions of years must pass before "the terrible coldness of icy space well enwrap the earth." The book is a study of cosmic decay in which familiar facts are presented in a style certain to prove attractive to the average reader interested in such themes.

LILIAN HELLER UDELL.

THE MENACE OF PRIVILEGE, by Henry George, Jr. Macmillan Co., New York. 421 pages \$1.50.

The single tax philosophy has taken a decidedly different turn within the last decade. When Henry George, Sr., wrote he said very little about "privilege" and very much about single tax. Now the emphasis is all

the other way and the single taxer sees "privilege" everywhere. He does not have the honesty, however, to admit that he is thereby recognizing what the socialists pointed out a half a century ago, that privilege is simply another name for the advantage which a ruling class obtains by reason of the fact that it has possession of the government and is in no way a peculiarity of landed property. The present work has summarized a great mass of information concerning the present capitalist class, their style of living, morality, etc., upon the one hand and of the general degradation of the working class upon the other. In the portion devoted to the weapons of privilege he has some very suggestive facts on control of the courts and government by capitalism but has to drag in his jargon about "privilege" in a way that vitiates the entire matter.

When we come to examine the theoretical and remedial portion, it is hard to avoid ridicule. Starting out with an intuitive philosophy and the idea of permanence in social laws perhaps he should not be expected to have any historical sense. We find the age of Washington and Franklin described as a sort of golden age in which "real poverty was casual and no where deep or chronic." It seems hard to believe that a man could be so palpably ignorant of American history as not to know that American labor probably reached its lowest depths in the years immediately following the revolutionary war.

A slight reference to McMaster or to Matthew Carey's "Olive Branch" or "Report on Philadelphia Charity," or "The Crisis" would have shown him that during the crisis of 1819 the unemployed, the beggar, and the soup house were familiar.

We have the same senseless chatter about "nature" that has persisted since the days of Rousseau among pseudo-sociologists, the fallaciousness of which has probably been exposed a thousand times during the last century. It is hard to believe that we are in the 20th century when we read such stuff as this: "The Principles of Political Economy do not rest upon human worth or human inactment. Nor do they change. They are based on laws of nature, which are eternal." Shades of Bastiat and Rousseau, Physiocrats and Mercantilists, arise from your forgotten tombs of a century ago to greet your resurrected and long exploded dogmas, now presented as the latest thing in radical literature.

NEW CREATIONS IN PLANT LIFE, by W. S. Harwood, *The MacMillan Co.* Cloth, 386 pp.

The work of Luther Burbank is perhaps more prophetic of what may be accomplished when intelligence is applied to production, especially in the fields of invention and innovation in general, than that of any other man of this century. He has shown the plasticity of plant forms in the hands of man to a degree that seems little less than magical. He has not simply "made two blades of grass grow where there was but one before," he has brought entirely new species of grass and plants of all kind into the world. He has multiplied the productive power of some plants, created others especially adapted to conditions hitherto hostile to plant life; he has doubled and trebled the size of some flowers and put new perfumes into others. The most striking of his recent accomplishments has been the production of the "Thornless Edible Cactus." This plant, which furnishes immense quantities of food for both men and cattle or horses, at once makes inhabitable great stretches of arid territory hitherto incapable of supporting animal life. He has evolved a tree that produces nuts within eighteen months after planting, and another that grows several times as fast as any hitherto known, thus solving the problem of timber, and, indeed, making it possible to raise timber by forestry methods which, because of its better character, ease of cutting, etc., can be produced much

cheaper than the primitive forests could be cut. These things should mean the final sod above the grave of already long dead Malthusianism. All this has been done within the life-time of a single man. It has not been done by any marvelous peculiar personal power, but simply by patience and skill and a highly developed power of observation. It requires a long period to produce results, and hence is ill suited to capitalist methods of business, but could best be carried on by governmental departments where the coming and going of individuals would not affect the progress of the work. Mr. Burbank, himself, says on this point: "There is work enough to be done in this line for the government to put at work a thousand experts, and the possibilities ahead of them are so great that the whole face of nature might be changed by them by an intelligent, patient and systematic following of breeding and selection." He is here referring to the possibilities in forestry alone, and the opportunities in many other fields are even greater. The book is one of intense interest and remarkably suggestive. This is because of the value of the matter treated, however, and not because of the method of presentation. The style is bombastic, sensational, "yellow." The writer is constantly interjecting observations of his own on all sorts of subjects, about some of which he knows very little. This is especially evident when he tries to show that Burbank has overthrown about all the laws of science. It is impossible to tell how much of the stuff appearing here is rightfully ascribed to Burbank, and how much is the opinion of Mr. Harwood. At any rate it would have improved the book to have omitted it. This is especially evident when the endeavor is made to show that the "inheritance of acquired characteristics" has been proved by Mr. Burbank's experiments. He may have done something of the kind, but Mr. Harwood, in trying to tell about it has only shown that he does not know the meaning of what he criticises. However, there are only a few pages of this sort of stuff and they can easily be skipped without impairing the value of the book.

SOCIALISM, UTOPIAN AND SCIENTIFIC, by Frederick Engels.. New edition. Standard Socialist Series. Charles H. Kerr & Company, cloth, 87 pages, 50 cents.

It has well been said that the history of this book is to a large extent the history of the socialist movement of the world. The present edition is by far the best one yet presented by any American publisher. It is significant of the growth of the movement that of the previous editions issued by the same house twenty thousand copies have been sold. It still remains the one great short classic of socialism, the reading of which along with the "Communist Manifesto" constitutes an absolute essential to an understanding of the socialist movement.

The Twentieth Century Press, of London, England, has issued in a handsome little booklet (price 2 pence) H. M. Hyndman's "*Death and the Socialist Ideal*," which appeared in Wilshire's magazine. Now that there seems to be a possibility that socialists may be called upon to engage in physical fighting this work is particularly timely.

The question of the *Massenstreik* is now agitating all Europe, and bids fair to occupy public attention in this country before long. Among the monographs which have appeared on this subject is one of Dr. Rudolph Penzig, published by the Neuer Frankfurter Verlag, on "*Massenstreik und Ethik*." This is devoted to the question as to whether a class struggling for freedom has a right, in order to advance its interests to involve society in such a fierce evil conflict as is involved in the *Massenstreik*.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

THE NEW BOOKS.

In this department of the REVIEW for January we gave full descriptions of fifteen new books which we promised to place in the hands of readers as soon as the necessary capital could be secured. We will not use valuable space in this issue to repeat what was there said. We wish, however to give definite information regarding the progress of the books announced.

THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

"The Changing Order," by Oscar Lowell Triggs, Ph. D.; and "Better-World Philosophy," by J. Howard Moore, are now ready, and will be mailed promptly on receipt of price, one dollar each.

"The Universal Kinship," by J. Howard Moore; and "Principles of Scientific Socialism," by Rev. Charles H. Vail, are now being printed and will be ready for delivery during February. Advance orders are solicited at one dollar each.

Dietzgen's "Philosophical Essays" are in type, but the correction of the proofs will consume some time. The first copies can hardly be ready for delivery till about the middle of March.

Two of our standard books, "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History," by Antonio Labriola; and "Love's Coming-of-Age," by Edward Carpenter, are now being re-printed in the attractive style of the International Library of Social Science, and will be the 6th and 7th volumes. Others will be announced soon.

THE STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES.

"The Positive School of Criminology," by Enrico Ferri, translated by Ernest Untermann, is nearly printed as we go to press with this issue of the REVIEW, and will be ready for mailing by about the time this announcement is in the hands of our readers. Price, 50 cents.

"The World's Revolutions," by Ernest Untermann, is in type and nearly ready for the press, and will be ready the last of February or early in March. Price, 50 cents.

"Social and Philosophical Studies," by Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr, has been unavoidably delayed, and as the proofs have to be sent to the author in Paris, copies can not be ready before May.

"The Socialists, who they are and what they stand for," by John Spargo, is a new propaganda work of first-class importance, the publication of which has been arranged for since the January REVIEW went to press. This book will be published in March as the 14th volume of the Standard Socialist Series. A full description of it will be given next month; meanwhile advance orders are solicited. Price, 50 cents.

THE LIBRARY OF SCIENCE FOR THE WORKERS.

"The Triumph of Life," by Wilhelm Boelsche, translated by May Wood Simons, is already in type as we go to press with the February REVIEW, and will be ready for mailing about the 20th. Several hundred advance orders have already been received, and the indications are that the book will have a sale even larger than that of "The Evolution of Man." Price, 50 cents.

A. M. Simons has nearly completed his translation of "Life and Death," by Dr. E. Teichmann, and we expect copies about the last of March.

Ernest Untermann has also nearly finished his translation of Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer's, "The Making of the World," and the printing will be finished some time in April.

We have been able to meet the printing bills as fast as they have come due, but the necessary outlay during February will be very heavy, and we ask every reader of the REVIEW to co-operate by sending at once a cash order for some of the new books. We are already giving better value for the money, as a simple business proposition, than the capitalist publishers of American copyright books. In saying this we refer to our retail prices. But those who buy many socialist books usually prefer to take advantage of our co-operative plan. By paying ten dollars for a share of stock, you get the right to buy our books at half the retail prices if sent at purchaser's expense, or forty per cent. discount if we pay postage.

The money received from the sale of stock is used to publish more socialist books. We only want ten dollars from each stockholder, because we want to place the future control of the publishing house in the hands of a great body of socialists. There are now over twelve hundred stockholders.

OUR RECORD FOR 1905.

The annual stockholders' meeting of the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Co. was held on January 15th. The report there made showed a most remarkable and gratifying improvement in the conditions of the business. It showed that during the past year books had been sold to the amount of \$10,587.37, that \$2,356.87 had been received for

the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, and that donations to the amount of \$1,686.35 had been received. One hundred and ninety-three new stockholders have entered the corporation during the past year, bringing a substantial increase in capital, and what is more important still, a wide extension of buyers, readers and distributors of socialist literature. The interest bearing debt to non-stockholders was practically wiped out and for the first time in the history of the company the receipts from sales of literature showed an actual balance over expense. The additional capital which had been contributed made possible the publication of more books during the past year than in any three previous years in the history of the company. The outlook for the forthcoming year would seem to indicate that this record in turn would be far exceeded during 1906. Seymour Stedman was elected to the board of directors and as secretary of the company for the ensuing year. Charles H. Kerr and A. M. Simons were re-elected as president and vice-president respectively.

OUR RECORD FOR JANUARY.

In the past history of the publishing house the book sales for one calendar month have never exceeded one thousand dollars. The sales of books during January, 1906, were \$1,232.19. The receipts on the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for the month were \$293.58, the income from subscriptions to stock \$301.28, and there were cash contributions from J. A. Teit, 60 cents; Dr. H. M. Wilson, \$1.60; and Wm. A. Schmidt, \$5.00; making the total receipts of the month, \$1,834.25.

WHAT TO READ ON SOCIALISM.

Four years ago under this title we published a booklet of thirty-two pages, the size to slip into a letter. It told what there was to tell about the books we had then. A little over two years ago, under the same title, we published a book of thirty-six pages the size of this REVIEW. Now we have in press a book of sixty-four pages under the same title. Each page will contain two columns each two and two-thirds inches wide and over eight inches long. The margins will be narrow and the paper will be light, because it is important to keep the postage on each book inside one cent. The book will contain first the substance of the five leaflets by Charles H. Kerr entitled, "What Socialists Think," which have been extensively circulated by the Socialist Party organization. There has been some complaint that these leaflets were not bound together instead of being printed separately, and it has been thought best to re-print them as an introduction to "What to Read." (A few thousands of the leaflets can still be had at \$1.50 per thousand sets, but they will not be re-printed.)

The remainder of the new book, after a brief explanation of the workings of our co-operative publishing house, will be taken up with descriptions of our literature. There will be one peculiar thing about these descriptions, distinguishing them from the advertising matter prepared by capitalist publishing houses. That is to say, the object of each

description is not to convince the reader that each individual book is the best ever written and should be ordered at all hazards. On the contrary, the object of each description is to enable the reader to judge to the best of his ability what information or entertainment each book does or does not offer, so that he may make an intelligent selection, and be pleased instead of disappointed when he comes to read the books. It is on this plan that our book advertising has been prepared from the start. We might have sold more copies each of a few books by using the other method, but the plan we have chosen has helped us find several thousands of socialist book-buyers who read all our new announcements with interest, and send to us whenever they want books.

To increase this army of readers is our object in printing "What to Read on Socialism." As soon as it is ready, we shall mail a copy to every stockholder, every REVIEW subscriber, every secretary of a socialist local, and every one who has sent us an order for books within the last six months. This will take not far from 10,000 of the pamphlets. But we shall print a first edition of 25,000, because we believe they will be wanted for propaganda. We expect to sell 15,000 copies as soon as the book is off the press. The price will be one dollar a hundred including postage either to one address or as many different addresses as desired, or 50 cents a hundred if expressage is paid by the purchaser. The actual cost of paper, press work and binding will be almost exactly a dollar a hundred, and the postage a dollar a hundred more, so that the price we charge does not begin to cover the cost. We ask a nominal price merely to make sure that all copies sent for will be put where they will be read, not wasted.

Send advance orders now, and the pamphlets will be sent as soon as the printing is finished, which we expect will be about February 25. Orders for less than 100 copies will be filled at the same rate, one cent a copy, postpaid. Better send a dollar with as many addresses as you think of. We will mail one book to each address, and the remainder of the hundred in a package to you. This is by far the best propaganda value for the money that we have ever been able to offer, and we look for an immediate response from the readers of the REVIEW. Address

Charles H. Kerr & Company (Co-operative),
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.